

## Judas Maccabaeus' Campaigns against Timothy <sup>(1)</sup>

Both 1 and 2 Maccabees contain accounts of campaigns which Judas Maccabaeus waged against a particularly pertinacious opponent called Timothy. Unfortunately, neither book offers an entirely clear account of them. In particular the placement of the campaigns within the history of the Maccabean revolt raises problems of historical interpretation since the two books present the campaigns in different contexts. Discussion thereof thus necessarily involves an old interpretative difficulty which has long vexed scholars: assessing properly the historical worth of the two Maccabean books.

### 1. *Correspondences between 1 and 2 Maccabees*

If we follow the strict order of events in 1 Maccabees, then immediately after the Purification of the Temple (on the conventional chronology December of the year 164 B.C.) <sup>(2)</sup> Judas and his fellow rebels engaged in a number of campaigns against the peoples round about Judaea:

- |       |  |
|-------|--|
| 5,3   | the Idumaeans  |
| 5,4-5 | the "sons of Baean" — presumably in the Transjordan <sup>(3)</sup> |
| 5,6-8 | the Ammonites <sup>(4)</sup> , led by Timothy                      |

<sup>(1)</sup> To my son Timothy, on whose name we had not yet agreed when I completed this manuscript.

<sup>(2)</sup> 1 Macc 4,52; cf. 2 Macc 10,5. The conventional chronology is most clearly explained in E.J. BICKERMANN, "Ein jüdischer Festbrief vom Jahre 124 v. Chr.", *Studies in Jewish and Christian History* (Leiden 1980) II, 144. See also: R. HANHART, "Zur Zeitrechnung des I und II Makkabäerbuches", *Untersuchungen zur israelitisch-jüdischen Chronologie* (Berlin 1964).

<sup>(3)</sup> Cf. Jubilees, 29,10. In both cases the reference is to Num 32,3. See G. HÖLSCHER, "Bemerkungen zur Topographie Palästinas", *ZDPV* 29 (1906) 134; F.-M. ABEL, "Topographie des campagnes machabéennes, 1", *RB* 32 (1923) 513. K. GALLING, "Judäa, Galiläa und der Osten in Jahre 164/3 v. Chr.", *PJ* 36 (1940) 52, suggests, however, a localisation in the environs of Jericho near the "stone of Bohan" — in Greek: Βοῶν — see Josh 15,6; 18,17.

<sup>(4)</sup> The author of 1 Maccabees has a strong preference for "historical" names: the Idumaeans (e.g. 1 Macc 5,3) are "the sons of Esau"; for Scythopolis he routinely sets Beth-shan — although the latter name in his day belonged exclusively to the past. Accordingly, the inhabitants east of the Transjordanian highlands are "Ammonites" — even if the historical tribe of that name had long since disappeared.

- 5,21-23 Judas' brother Simon campaigns in the Galilee
- 5,24-54 Judas himself campaigns in Gilead — again against Timothy
- 5,56-62 Joseph, one of Judas' lieutenants, campaigns in the coastal plain
- 5,65-68 Judas campaigns against the Idumaeans near Hebron, but then descends to the coastal plain to attack Azotus on the coast

Immediately after the conclusion of these far-ranging campaigns against the peoples round about we read of Antiochus IV's death, which took place in, roughly, December of the year 164 B.C. <sup>(5)</sup>.

That something is not in order here should make itself apparent rather rapidly. Either we have erred in our conventional chronology (as Klaus Bringmann has argued) <sup>(6)</sup> or 1 Maccabees has departed from chronological order in placing the description of these campaigns between the Purification and Antiochus IV's death. I hope elsewhere to have shewn that Bringmann does not, in fact, have a case <sup>(7)</sup>; and feel that we should therefore investigate the possibility that 1 Maccabees is not setting down events in succession and order in the manner we moderns think it only just and fitting for an historian to do <sup>(8)</sup>.

An aprioristic consideration may warrant this procedure. First, chap. 5 in 1 Maccabees gives the impression of a summary of thema-

<sup>(5)</sup> A.J. SACHS – D.J. WISEMAN, "A Babylonian Kinglist of the Hellenistic Period", *Iraq* 16 (1954) 202-211.

<sup>(6)</sup> K. BRINGMANN, *Hellenistische Reform und Religionsverfolgung in Judäa* (Göttingen 1983) 26. (An earlier study such as that of W. KOLBE, *Beiträge zur syrischen und jüdischen Geschichte* [Stuttgart 1926] — see e.g. 47-55 and chart on 125 — could still escape the problem through a too late death for Antiochus IV [in Kolbe's case: April of 163 B.C.] and thus leave some room for Judas' struggles against neighbouring peoples. All the same Kolbe does concede [133-134] that the room thus left does not suffice for all the fighting and argues that 1 Maccabees [see below n. 9] has thematically arranged fighting which did begin then, just continued into the next year[s].)

<sup>(7)</sup> V. PARKER, "The Campaigns of Lysias in Judaea: A test of the historical worth of 2 Maccabees" (in press).

<sup>(8)</sup> The problem bedevils much modern scholarship on ancient historians. For example, in the case of Thucydides one may refer to many dogmatic statements that he always gives a strictly diachronic arrangement of events: e.g. B.D. MERITT et al., *The Athenian Tribute Lists* (Princeton 1950) III, 160-162. On the problems with this view see E. BADIAN, "Towards a Chronology of the Pentekontaetia down to the Peace of Callias", *Échos du Monde Classique* 32 (1988) 296-301. The interpretation of many other historians besides Thucydides has suffered from this modern need always to see in their works an adherence to exact chronological order.

tically related campaigns (possibly in overall chronological order) rather than, say, a year's worth of integrally related campaigning<sup>(9)</sup>. 2 Maccabees, as we shall shortly see, does divide these campaigns up into several discrete periods of time. Next, chap. 5 mentions what appear to be two distinct campaigns against Timothy in the Transjordan. Do both campaigns really belong to one integral series of campaigns or are they instead separate campaigns spread out over several years? Again, 2 Maccabees treats these campaigns as discrete in time.

In these two last points, however, we have posited, without yet so proving, that 1 and 2 Maccabees do indeed refer to the same events. We now hasten to make good that omission.

On three occasions in 2 Maccabees we read of such campaigns:

- 8,30-32     a brief mention of a battle against Timothy and Bacchides (in which an 'officer' with Timothy's forces is slain — this passage stands before both Purification and Antiochus IV's death<sup>(10)</sup>, but as we shall see, it is not immediately patent that this passage stands in its original position in 2 Maccabees)

<sup>(9)</sup> Thus, at least, the older *communis opinio*: See (e.g.) B. NIESE, "Kritik der beiden Makkabäerbücher nebst Beiträgen zur Geschichte der Makkabäischen Erhebung", *Hermes* 35 (1900) 471; ABEL, "Topographie", 512. GALLING, "Judäa", 44, is perfectly clear on the point: "Es ist allgemein anerkannt, daß die in dem Kapitel behandelten Kämpfe hier mit bewußter Absicht zusammengestellt sind..." E. MEYER, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums* (Stuttgart 1921) II, 228, notes 1 and 4, views 1 Macc 5 as indeed a summary and spreads the campaigns out (with few details) over the years 164 and 163 (223-231). On the other hand, J. GOLDSTEIN, *1 Maccabees* (New York 1976) 166, (with little argument) places these campaigns in a group in "164, to some time in April, 163" "from soon after the [Purification] (perhaps before the death of Antiochus IV)". The very last campaigns in 1 Macc 5 (i.e. those in verses 65-68) he dates to "late April or May" of 163 B.C. The *communis opinio* may have shifted.

<sup>(10)</sup> In 2 Maccabees the account of Antiochus IV's death now stands in chap. 9 but it originally stood after 10,8 — see J. GOLDSTEIN, *2 Maccabees* (New York 1983) 345-347. This "relocation" of the account does not affect how it stands in relation to any campaign against Timothy. At any rate, the transposition of chap. 9 and 10,1-8 seems to have been undertaken to remove one of the many contradictions between the main narrative and the fictive letter now at 2 Macc 1,10-2,18. This letter was secondarily attached to the main narrative in particularly clumsy scissors-and-paste work; and the person who attached it may well have also moved chapter 9 to where it now stands. Most have viewed this person as a later revisor distinct from the epitomator; and I have argued elsewhere at length for this view: "The Letters in 2 Maccabees: Reflexions on the book's composition", *ZAW* (in press).

- 10,14-23 campaigns against the Idumaeans
- 10,24-38 campaigns against Timothy, to all appearances in the coastal plain, and Timothy is slain — after Antiochus IV's death
- 12,3-9 Jews of Joppa are massacred; Judas (in lieu of Joppa) attacks Jamnia
- 12,2.10-31 Judas campaigns against Timothy in Gilead
- 12,32-37 Judas campaigns against the Idumaeans and in the Shephelah, but does not descend to the coastal plain

Again, we can clearly see problems with this account. Chap. 12 apparently speaks of the same Timothy as does chap. 10 — in which the account of Timothy's death stands. *Prima facie* chronological order has not been maintained or the passages speak, despite appearances, of two different men named Timothy — or something else is badly amiss<sup>(11)</sup>. Moreover, the first mention of Timothy, in 8,30-32, comes in an isolated passage embedded in the context of a campaign against the Seleucid general Nicanor, a context which does not explain who Timothy is or why Judas is campaigning against him. Many have suspected that the passage has erroneously come to stand where it now does.

Notwithstanding these problems, we can at least constate that 1 and 2 Maccabees, to some extent, are speaking of the same events and of the same Timothy. First, both books do place Timothy in the Transjordan: 1 Macc 5,6-8 makes him the leader of "Ammonites" — i.e. uses an old ethnic name to denote the denizens of the area to the East of the Transjordanian highlands. The other campaign against Timothy takes place in Gilead: 1 Macc 5,24-54. In 2 Macc 12,10-31 the mention of the towns Carnaim (vv. 21 and 26) and Ephron firmly locates the story in the Transjordan (v. 27)<sup>(12)</sup>.

<sup>(11)</sup> R. LAQUEUR, *Kritische Untersuchungen zum 2. Makkabäerbuch* (Straßburg 1904) 72-87, develops a complicated view of two separate sources within 2 Maccabees (cf. W. GRIMM, *II Buch der Makkabäer*. Kurzgefaßtes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des Alten Testaments [Leipzig 1853] 174); and the accounts of Timothy in chaps. 10 and 12 play a key rôle in his arguments. He views these two accounts as doublets (77) which the author of 2 Maccabees failed to recognise as such — esp. given the low importance of the man Timothy (79). In our opinion there is no doublet, however (see below, section 2); and the other observations of Laqueur's, which he interprets as remnants of the sewing together of two sources, point, we feel, towards the reworking of the material so as to move Antiochus IV's death to an earlier date (see below, n. 61). Rejecting LAQUEUR's view see also K.-D. SCHUNK, *Die Quellen des I. und II Makkabäerbuches* (Halle 1954) 91-93.

<sup>(12)</sup> ABEL, "Topographie", 520-521.

Second, with regard to the last campaign against Timothy in both books, much fighting takes place near the town of Carnaim. Thereafter both books have Judas attack and take Ephron. In addition, the town of Caspin (in 2 Macc 12,13) is probably identical with that of Caspho (1 Macc 5,36)<sup>(13)</sup>: Judas fights at each place in the respective books. Moreover, at the end of both books' accounts of this campaign, Judas marches towards Scythopolis or, as 1 Maccabees prefers to call it, Beth-Shan (2 Macc 12,29 and 1 Macc 5,52)<sup>(14)</sup>. Finally, the beleaguered Jews of "Toubias" at 1 Macc 5,13 are surely identical with the Jews called "Toubianoï" to whom Judas comes at 2 Macc 12,17<sup>(15)</sup>. We may entertain no doubt that both books are here describing the same campaign against the same commander in the Transjordan.

Third, both books describe this mysterious commander called Timothy in the same way and attribute to him similar actions. Both books present him as a tenacious opponent of Judas, but neither (curiously) assigns to him any official Seleucid position. While 2 Maccabees does present Timothy as acting in concert with Seleucid officials<sup>(16)</sup>, it never claims for him any post<sup>(17)</sup>; and 1 Maccabees

<sup>(13)</sup> Ibid., 517.

<sup>(14)</sup> See above, n. 4.

<sup>(15)</sup> ABEL, "Topographie", 515-516: cf. Judg 11,3; 2 Sam 10,6; Ptolemy, 5.18. Although, strictly speaking, Judas in 1 Maccabees never actually goes to the rescue of these Jews (at least not explicitly), this is surely implied. On the region involved (and its history) see B. MAZAR, "The Tobiads", *IEJ* 7 (1957) 137-145, 229-238, esp. 139; see also H. WILLRICH, "Zur Geschichte der Tobiaden", *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 7 (1924) 62-63.

<sup>(16)</sup> 2 Macc 8,30 (cf. 1 Macc 9,1); 2 Macc 12,2 (Against I. LEVY, "Notes d'histoire hellénistique sur le second livre des Maccabées. II. Ptolémée, fils de Makron", *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves* 10 (1950) 695 with n.1, ὁ κατὰ τόπον στρατηγός is no official Seleucid rank, [see B. BAR-KOCHVA, *The Seleucid Army* (Cambridge 1976) 85-93] but rather a catch-all term — "commander in the area" — which could denote any military leader against whom Judas fought, not just those with official appointments from the Seleucid court.)

<sup>(17)</sup> From time to time scholars have attempted to turn Timothy into a Seleucid official, e.g. F.X. KUGLER, *Von Moses bis Paulus* (Münster 1922) 385 and 396; BRINGMANN, *Hellenistische Reform*, 61 (cf. 162: "seleuk. Stratege"); SCHUNK, *Quellen*, 111. (Schunk argues that Timothy's use of οἱ τῆς Ἀσίας ἵπποι "the horses of Asia", demonstrates that the Timothy at 2 Macc 10,24-38 was indeed a Seleucid officer since such cavalry were "Regierungstruppen" — 111-112. On this, however, see B. BAR-KOCHVA, *Judas Maccabaeus* (Cambridge 1989) 514: all that is meant [rightly or wrongly] is that Timothy was employing the particularly impressive battle-horses of Iran, i.e. had mustered a terrifying army. Schunk's other arguments in this context are dealt with at the appropriate points.)

places him amongst the neighbouring “nations” who menace the Jews: he is the leader of “Ammonites” and others, but never a Seleucid general like Lysias or Nicanor<sup>(18)</sup>. Also, in both books Timothy hires mercenaries, in particular Arabs, to fight against Judas<sup>(19)</sup>.

Finally, in both books the sequence of campaigns against the neighbouring peoples is substantially the same, albeit with omissions: the first campaign against Timothy is absent from 1 Maccabees as is Judas’ campaign against Jamnia; likewise, one fails to find in 2 Maccabees the campaign against the sons of Baean, Joseph’s campaigns in the coastal plain, and Judas’ campaign against Azotus. All the same, the four campaigns which both books have in common do stand in the exact same sequence. As Kolbe put it, “wir haben es...mit identischen Darstellungen der gleichen Ereignisse zu tun, die sich gegenseitig ergänzen, aber nirgends widersprechen”<sup>(20)</sup>.

## 2. *The Campaign at 2 Macc 10,24-38 and 1 Macc 5,6-8*

If we have then shewn that 1 and 2 Maccabees are, in general, at least speaking of the same man and the same campaigns, and that the campaign at 2 Macc 12,2.10-31 corresponds to that at 1 Macc 5,24-54<sup>(21)</sup>, our next task must then be to determine if 2 Macc 10,24-38 and 8,30-32 also correspond clearly to accounts in 1 Maccabees.

A case can be made for the second campaign in 2 Maccabees, that it corresponds to that at 1 Macc 5,6-8<sup>(22)</sup>. The terse account in 1 Maccabees has Judas defeating Timothy and then — after the main battle, in an action not clearly related to the campaign against Timothy — taking a town on the way back to Judaea. In 2 Macc 10,24-38 Judas defeats Timothy in a battle, after which Timothy flees to a town which Judas takes by storm. Although the account in 2 Maccabees is expansive (in contrast to the brevity of 1 Maccabees), the added material proves, with one or just possibly two exceptions, little more

<sup>(18)</sup> 1 Macc 5,6.

<sup>(19)</sup> 1 Macc 5,39; 2 Macc 10,24 and 12,10.

<sup>(20)</sup> KOLBE, *Beiträge*, 133. Cf. J. SIEVERS, *The Hasmoneans and their Supporters from Mattathias to the Death of John Hyrcanus I* (Atlanta 1990) 51-52.

<sup>(21)</sup> For a synopsis of the two accounts (together with Josephus’ version) see J. SIEVERS, *Synopsis of the Greek Sources for the Hasmonean period : 1-2 Maccabees and Josephus, War 1 and Antiquities 12-14* (Subsidia Biblica 20; Roma 2001) 86-98.

<sup>(22)</sup> For a synopsis see SIEVERS, *Synopsis*, 74-76.

than rhetorical divagation and literary topos: Judas and his men pray and fast before the battle (in 2 Maccabees far more is made of Judas' and his men's unrelenting piety than in 1 Maccabees)<sup>(23)</sup>; during the battle five horsemen with shining bridles descend from Heaven and guard Judas during the battle (2 Maccabees abounds in similar miracles — a circumstance scholars commonly allege to discredit the book as an historical source)<sup>(24)</sup>; the inhabitants of the town which Judas sacks after the battle blaspheme and mock the Jews (in 2 Maccabees Judas' opponents are routinely presented or apostrophised as blasphemers)<sup>(25)</sup>; the details concerning Judas' storming of the town are standard ones, easily supplied by the author<sup>(26)</sup>. Once we strip away rhetoric and topos, we have before us substantially the same account as in 1 Maccabees.

Yet we must note the two exceptions: First, in 1 Maccabees the sacked town is called Jazer, which lies in the Transjordan. In 2 Maccabees it is Gazara which lies in the coastal plain west of the Judaeian Hill Country. Next, in 2 Maccabees we read how, after the sack of the town, Timothy is captured and slain. One could explain away the second as just another rhetorical expansion — the malefactor Timothy receives his just deserts<sup>(27)</sup> —, yet unlike the others, which have no discernible impact on the remaining narrative (which they simply enliven), this one jars violently against it. After all, Timothy reappears in chap. 12 to do battle against Judas once more.

We may toy with several theoretically possible albeit cheap solutions, if only to reject them: First, we could assume that Jason of Cyrene mentioned Timothy's death proleptically and that the Epitomator, through faulty abridging, erased the statements indicating that Jason had told of Timothy's death out of chronological

<sup>(23)</sup> E.g. in 1 Maccabees the Jewish rebels fight (when attacked) on the Sabbath (1 Macc 2,29-41), but 2 Maccabees accepts no "pragmatic" interpretations of the relevant precept — see esp. 2 Macc 15,1-5; cf. 2 Macc 8,25-26. On the Maccabees' general piety in 2 Maccabees see also 12,39-45.

<sup>(24)</sup> Additional miracles: 2 Macc 3,25-26; 5,1-4. On the negative opinion which these miracles have evoked in modern commentators: E. KAUTZSCH, "Das erste Buch der Makkabäer", *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments* (Tübingen 1900; 5<sup>th</sup> unaltered edition, Hildesheim 1992) 26; M. NOTH, *Geschichte Israels* (Göttingen 1956) 322-323.

<sup>(25)</sup> See (e.g.) 2 Macc 9,28; 12,14; 13,11.

<sup>(26)</sup> Cf. 2 Macc 12,14-16a.27b.

<sup>(27)</sup> See BAR-KOCHVA, *Judas*, 513.



sequence<sup>(28)</sup>. Diodorus of Sicily created similar confusion in his abridgement of Ephorus<sup>(29)</sup>, so this assumption would not stand without parallel. Yet we should, as I have argued elsewhere, hesitate to impute the carefree incoherence of a Diodorus to this particular Epitomator who seems to have removed internal contradictions in his work wherever he noticed them<sup>(30)</sup>.

Second, one might argue that the account at 2 Macc 10,24-38 has come to stand before the account at 2 Macc 12,10-31 only through a clumsy transposition in our text<sup>(31)</sup>: originally, the former account had stood after the latter with Timothy's death at the end of the sequence. Yet, provided that 1 Macc 5,6-8 correspond to 2 Macc 10,24-38, then 1 Maccabees presents these two campaigns in the same order. As many have noted, 1 and 2 Maccabees show substantial overlap in material and, often, even in phrasing; and where they have this overlap we should assume that, ultimately, they depend on the same source material<sup>(32)</sup>. Conventionally, we should assume that the ordering of these two campaigns belonged to the two books' source(s).

This brings us to a third possible solution which, by contrast, does merit serious consideration: the campaign at 2 Macc 10,24-38 is different from that at 1 Macc 5,6-8; and the Timothy involved at 2 Macc 10,24-38 is a different man from the one in 2 Macc 12,10-31<sup>(33)</sup>. One detail supports this solution: in 2 Macc 10,24-38 the town which Judas sacks at the end is Gazara; in 1 Macc 5,6-8 it is Jazer<sup>(34)</sup>.

<sup>(28)</sup> Ibid., 512, suggests something similar in his arguments on how the episode at 2 Macc 8,30-32 has come to stand where it now does.

<sup>(29)</sup> Diodorus, 12.35.4 has King Archidamus of Sparta die in the year 434/433; yet Archidamus still invades Attica in 431-430 according to 12.42.6.

<sup>(30)</sup> PARKER, *Campaigns* (in press).

<sup>(31)</sup> MEYER, *Ursprung*, 459; F.-M. ABEL, *Les Livres des Maccabées* (Paris 1949) 416. Cf. also SCHUNK, *Quellen*, 112-114; M. ZAMBELLI, "La composizione del secondo libro dei Maccabei e la nuova cronologia di Antioco IV Epiphane", *Miscellanea Greca e Romana* (Rome 1965) 277-278; C. HABICHT, "2. Makkabäerbuch", *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit* (Gütersloh 1979) I.3, 250-251 note "a" to verse 11.

<sup>(32)</sup> See (e.g.) GOLDSTEIN, *2 Maccabees*, 28-49; KOLBE, *Beiträge*, 124-136; cf. SIEVERS, *Hasmoneans*, 52-56.

<sup>(33)</sup> Thus D.A. SCHLATTER, *Jason von Kyrene* (Munich 1893) 23; KUGLER, *Moses*, 372-373; H. BEVENOT, *Die beiden Makkabäerbücher* (Bonn 1931) 227 (though he is not explicit on the point); SCHUNK, *Quellen*, 111. J. REGNER, "Timotheus, 8", *RE* (1937) VI, 1330-1331; A. BÜCHLER, *Tobiaden und Oniaden* (Wien 1899) 301, n. 14; 321, n. 24; and 323-324.

<sup>(34)</sup> See esp. KUGLER, *Moses*, 373.



Notwithstanding, I believe that we need to consider a fourth solution, one which takes into account what we have noted above and which kills the two problematic birds (Timothy's narratologically premature death; the location of the campaign in the coastal plain) if not with a single stone, then at least with only two. The Epitomator I feel I have shewn elsewhere had a keen eye for contradictions and removed them. If he did not remove the apparent contradiction in regard to Timothy's death, it was because he did not reckon it one: *uidelicet*, he thought that it was a different Timothy in 2 Macc 10,24-38 from the one at 12,10-31.

We now come to the toponym "Gazara." Time and again modern scholars, grappling with the same basic problem as, in our opinion, the Epitomator himself, have suggested emending "Gazara" to "Iazer" <sup>(35)</sup>. This would, granted, remove an inconsistency between 1 Macc 5,6-8 and 2 Macc 10,24-38; but it still does not help us with Timothy's narratologically premature death: indeed, the emendation blocks off the last possible path around the contradiction, namely the argument that there were two opponents of Judas called Timothy. Furthermore, all our manuscripts of 2 Maccabees (and all the manuscripts of the early translations, insofar as we can ascertain, support this) with but one exception write Γαζαρά <sup>(36)</sup>. Proper method compels the assumption that the author of the text of 2 Maccabees — and by "author" we mean here the Epitomator — set nothing other than Γαζαρά <sup>(37)</sup>.

Discussion has always turned on the assumption that the Epitomator accidentally made a mistake: whether the result of a *lapsus calami* (accidentally writing Γαζαρά for Ιαζήρ) <sup>(38)</sup> or that of a

<sup>(35)</sup> J. WELLHAUSEN, "Über den geschichtlichen Wert des zweiten Makkabäerbuchs im Verhältnis zum ersten", *NGAW* (1905) Heft 2, 141; ABEL, *Livres*, 415 (who, however, considers the possibility of correcting to Gadara or Gadara — which latter possibility appears as certain on 416); GOLDSTEIN, II, 393-394; BAR-KOCHVA, *Judas*, 512-513; SIEVERS, *Hasmoneans*, 54. A handful of scholars have, however, argued for retaining Gazara in 2 Macc 10,32: KUGLER, *Moses*, 373-374; BEVENOT, *Makkabäerbücher*, 221; SCHUNK, *Quellen*, 112 n.1.

<sup>(36)</sup> R. HANHART, *Maccabaeorum Liber II* (Göttingen 1976) 92, books but one variant reading, namely Γαδαρά (probably just a minor miswriting of all the other manuscripts' Γαζαρά).

<sup>(37)</sup> Cf. GOLDSTEIN, *2 Maccabees*, 394.

<sup>(38)</sup> Since 2 Maccabees was originally composed in Greek we should probably try to explain any alleged miswriting in Greek terms — though see GOLDSTEIN, *2 Maccabees*, 393.

mishearing (actually hearing יעזר but imagining that he had heard גזר). Neither mistake seems to us inherently probable; and when making such emendations one must always guard against the wish's becoming father to the thought: the reason for making the emendation arises not of any actual perception of disorder in the text, but of a desire to make the text say what we think it should. But if we accept that the Epitomator did write Γαζαπα (mistakenly or not), then perhaps we might suggest that he did so on purpose.

Now our suggestion imputes to the Epitomator nothing more than the same desire of modern scholars to expunge inconsistency from the text where he found it. We can see this same desire operating within him elsewhere in my view<sup>(39)</sup>, so we need not blench at it in the case at hand. What I suggest is that the Epitomator, seeing in Timothy's death at 2 Macc 10,24-38 the same contradiction which all of us have also seen, solved the problem to his own satisfaction: He assumed that it was a different Timothy<sup>(40)</sup>; and that the mention of Iazer in the work which he was epitomising was false precisely because this — and only this — detail mandated the identification of the one Timothy with the other. In a word, the Epitomator posited (falsely) in Jason of Cyrene the reverse of the error which modern scholars (equally falsely) have imputed to him.

The Epitomator thus removed the contradiction in question. In 2 Maccabees we have then a mistake upon the initial mistake (Timothy's death mentioned prematurely). The initial mistake we must then attribute to Jason of Cyrene who, in his eagerness to see Timothy off with a just punishment, got ahead of his story<sup>(41)</sup>. The error may not have struck Jason as it now strikes us: Although we have little idea of the true size of Jason's work in five books, we must assume that he told Judas' story at some length — else an epitome would not have become necessary. In Jason's history considerable tracts of verbiage may have lain between Timothy's death and his reappearance. Jason may have made an honest mistake in failing to recognise that the Timothy of the one campaign was the same as that in the other. The fiction of Timothy's death, however, need not have been honest; and may well belong on the same order of wishful thinking as the appearance of the magnificent five horsemen: in brief, in his desire to see Timothy condignly punished, Jason embroidered a bit.

<sup>(39)</sup> PARKER, *Campaigns* (in press).

<sup>(40)</sup> Cf. also BAR-KOCHVA, *Judas*, 513.

<sup>(41)</sup> Cf. BAR-KOCHVA, *Judas*, 513.

To conclude this section: 2 Macc 10,24-38 corresponds to 1 Macc 5,6-8. The latter account, as to detail, is far more accurate in that it makes no mention of Timothy's death and identifies the town which Judas sacked as Iazer. However, we have reason to believe that Jason of Cyrene did thus identify the town; though Jason's eagerness to finish Timothy off caused his Epitomator to alter the name of the town in a desire to make the Timothy involved seem a different man. In any case the Epitomator included a phrase at 2 Macc 10,24 which clearly identifies the Timothy involved as the same as the one in 2 Macc 8,30-32. No such phrase stands in chap. 12 — as though the Epitomator were certain that this time it was a different Timothy<sup>(42)</sup>.

### 3. *The Campaign at 2 Macc 8,30-32.(33)*

We come now to the final campaign against Timothy in 2 Maccabees; the one which stands in chap. 8,30-32. This campaign finds no clear correspondence in 1 Maccabees: Timothy acts in concert with a Seleucid officer named Bacchides. 1 Maccabees knows of a Bacchides, but in a completely different context and certainly never in connexion with Timothy<sup>(43)</sup>. 2 Maccabees recounts the story of this campaign immediately before the Purification of the Temple<sup>(44)</sup>; and 1 Maccabees knows of no such campaign at all during that period.

Scholars have, however, suggested that this campaign against Timothy stands in the wrong place<sup>(45)</sup>. Given that the account of this

<sup>(42)</sup> Thus — especially — BÜCHLER, *Tobiaden*, 321, n. 24; See KOLBE, *Beiträge*, 129-130, for a discussion of the ways in which the Maccabean books distinguish between homonymous men.

<sup>(43)</sup> 1 Macc 7,8. (Josephus, *Bellum*, I 1,2-3, mentions yet another Bacchides as a Seleucid official whom Mattathias, Judas' father, slew.)

<sup>(44)</sup> N.b. that originally 2 Macc 9 stood after 10,8 (see above n. 9), so that the account of the Purification followed directly on chap. 8.

<sup>(45)</sup> BAR-KOCHVA, *Judas*, 508-515 (the passage summarises much later campaigns in Gilead); KOLBE, *Beiträge*, 32 (the passage is a doublet to 10,24-38; cf. BÜCHLER, *Tobiaden*, 324; J.G. BUNGE, *Untersuchungen zum zweiten Makkabäerbuch* [Bonn 1971] 283-284); ABEL, *Livres*, 393, calls it a "fragment déplacé"; BEVENOT, *Makkabäerbücher*, 210-211, argues for identity with 1 Macc 5,6-8, but does not explain which book has the correct chronology. Cf. WELLHAUSEN, *Wert*, 137-138. MEYER, *Ursprung*, 208 with n. 3, views this campaign of Timothy's and Bacchides' as identical to Lysias' campaign in 1 Macc 4,28-36 (whereby he seems to fail to see that these last verses clearly correspond to 2 Macc 11,1-15). (The commonly noted similarity [not identity] of the number of the slain at 2 Macc 8,30 and that at 2 Macc 10,31 does not appear to the current author to hold much significance in the debate whether 8,30-32 and

campaign stands in the middle of a narrative of fighting against Nicanor and that nothing in this larger context explains who Timothy and Bacchides are or why Judas is fighting them, this view clearly has merit.

Nevertheless, the Epitomator, when he introduced the campaign against Timothy in chap. 10,24-38, made clear that he knew that he had mentioned an earlier campaign against Timothy since he introduced this section with the words Τιμόθεος δὲ ὁ πρότερον ἡττηθείς “Timothy, who had previously been defeated...”<sup>(46)</sup>. Finally, 9,3 contains another reference to this first defeat of Timothy and explicitly places it before Antiochus IV’s death<sup>(47)</sup>. We should, again, concede that the Epitomator knew what he did; and that he thought that the campaign at 2 Macc 8,30-32 had preceded that at 10,24-38 and indeed Antiochus IV’s death. If he thought so correctly is another matter entirely.

Let us then investigate the verses 8,30-32 more closely. The author seems already to have brought the story of the fighting against Nicanor to an end: vv. 24-25 speak of Judas’ victory and vv. 27-29 of his division of the spoils. Despite the lack of any sort of transitional statement, v. 30 could begin the account of another, less important campaign, which Judas fought immediately subsequent to that against Nicanor. After all, the mere act of epitomising may have rendered the connexion between this campaign and its narrative context unclear<sup>(48)</sup>. One may refer to countless examples in Florus, Eutropius, Justin and Diodorus of how the respective Epitomator may accidentally have

---

10,24-38 are doublets: 2 Maccabees wildly inflates all numbers of enemy forces and enemy slain, and two inflated figures, grabbed out of thin air anyway, may have coincidentally come out about the same.)

<sup>(46)</sup> 2 Macc 10,24. GOLDSTEIN, *2 Maccabees*, 395-397, argues that the text should read Τιμόθεος δὲ ὁ πρότερον ἡττηθείς and suggests that we understand this as meaning, “the Timothy who was defeated first [i.e. the first of two by that name]”. This is strained Greek which furthermore requires a radical re-interpretation of the text at 2 Macc 8,32: for (the perfectly intelligible) τὸν φυλάρχην τῶν περὶ Τιμόθεον ἀνείλον, “they slew the ‘phylarch’ of Timothy’s troops”, GOLDSTEIN, II, 340, suggests understanding, “of the two men called Timothy they slew the one who was a ‘phylarch’”. The passage in Polybius (V 1,7-9) which Goldstein cites in this context does not support his interpretation of the wording of 2 Maccabees. Nevertheless, this passage does shew that a better translation of the idiom in question might be “they slew Timothy’s phylarch”.

<sup>(47)</sup> Cf. here BÜCHLER, *Tobiaden*, 301, n. 14.

<sup>(48)</sup> GRIMM, *II Buch*, 143; Cf. BAR-KOCHVA, *Judas*, 512.

made turgid what had been a pellucid connexion between two events<sup>(49)</sup>. Still, the lack of any clear connexion between v. 30 and what precedes it must disturb. To proceed, however: v. 31 mentions the rebels' transport of booty to Jerusalem<sup>(50)</sup>. V. 33 follows on from that when it speaks of the ensuing victory celebrations in the native city<sup>(51)</sup>

<sup>(49)</sup> Some examples: Florus, *Epitoma de Tito Livio*, I 36,10-18, abruptly introduces Marius (13) into the account of the Jugurthine War with no indication of the bitter quarrel between Marius and Metellus or of the political manoeuvring whereby Metellus lost his command to Marius: indeed, Florus recounts Metellus' success in chasing Jugurtha from Numidia and across Mauretania and Gaetulia (12). In the next paragraph, however, we suddenly read of the new commander Marius. Surely Livy had explained Marius' assumption of the command better. Eutropius, *Breviarum*, IV 11 (based, in the main at least, on Livy) states in one sentence that King Massinissa of Numidia died and left behind 44 sons. The next sentence states that Scipio received the task of dividing the kingdom up amongst these sons. Since Eutropius adds nothing farther to this, the reader naturally assumes that all 44 inherited the kingdom. In fact (see Appian, *Libyca*, 106; cf. Zonaras, IX 27; cf. Sallust, *Bellum Jugurthinum*, 5,4-6) only three sons of Massinissa's succeeded him. Again, Livy surely had explained this properly; Eutropius simply copied out the notice on the number of Massinissa's male progeny and set after this an originally unconnected (or at any rate better connected) statement on the division of the kingdom after Massinissa's death. Justin, *Epitoma Historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi*, XI 14, 10-12, recounts Alexander's taking of Persepolis and then moves straight to Darius III's captivity and death (15,1-5). The other accounts of Alexander's expedition make clear that Darius III did not fall victim to his erstwhile supporters' coup-d'état until after he had fled from Ecbatana (whither Alexander marched from Persepolis) and had thereby shown that he could mount no farther effective resistance against Alexander. Finally, Diodorus, XV 76, offers us four utterly unconnected statements on events in the year 366/365 B.C.: the seizure of Oropus from Athens first by Eretria, then by Boeotia; the transfer of the city of Cos to a new site; a renewal of the King's Peace; and, finally, a list of notable intellectuals of the period. Surely, Ephorus' history, which Diodorus was abridging, had had some sort of a connected narrative here, several salient sections of which Diodorus simply summarised briefly without any attempt at achieving narrative coherence.

<sup>(50)</sup> Some scholars (e.g. BUNGE, *Untersuchungen*, 280; BAR-KOCHVA, *Judas*, 510-511) have felt that the reference to the transport of the booty to Jerusalem presupposes that Judas had already taken possession of the city. This may be so, but it does not tell us how long Judas had held the city nor how exactly he took it.

<sup>(51)</sup> On the sense of πατρίς see ABEL, *Livres*, 395. BUNGE, *Untersuchungen*, 281 (whom HABICHT, 2. *Makkabäerbuch*, 242 note b to verse 33, follows), argues that πατρίς here must mean "home" as opposed to "native city," but finds it "kaum glaubhaft" when he comes to the word's concrete interpretation, that "Judaea" – the only other conceivable possibility – could be meant (284). The aporia out of which he then seeks escape is entirely of his own making.

of Judas and his men, i.e. Jerusalem. In other words v. 33 is connected by context to vv. 30-32.

Now with regard to v. 33 Benedictus Niese pointed out long ago that 2 Maccabees implies that Judas had to take Jerusalem with violence when he entered it in the year 164 B.C.<sup>(52)</sup> The reference to Callisthenes' punishment for burning the sacred gateway in v. 33 (in the course of the celebrations after Judas' entrance into the city) finds its explanation in other references to a fire in this structure — apparently set by enemies of Judas in the course of what could only have been a violent confrontation between them and Judas<sup>(53)</sup>. The later reference to those whom Judas banned from Jerusalem (2 Macc 10,15) points in the same direction. In any case, Flavius Josephus (following in all probability an ultimately non-Jewish source)<sup>(54)</sup> also speaks of Judas' violent taking of Jerusalem<sup>(55)</sup>. If 2 Maccabees preserves traces of this (historically more probable) version, it has sought to obfuscate the episode. The Epitomator may have subjected this episode to a rather drastic abridgement, leaving behind only a single verse.

The verse which he left behind, however, bears an interesting thematic relationship to what precedes. V. 33 tells how an impious man, Callisthenes, met with his just deserts. V. 32 — which ends the episode involving Timothy — concludes with the mention of the death of an "officer" in Timothy's forces, "a most impious man who had done the Jews much harm"<sup>(56)</sup>. This theme extends into vv. 34-36

<sup>(52)</sup> NIESE, *Kritik*, 467.

<sup>(53)</sup> 2 Macc 1,8; cf. 1 Macc 4,38.

<sup>(54)</sup> See A. BUCHLER, "Les sources de Flavius Josèphe, I", *REJ* (1896) esp. 181-183. Buchler suggests Polybius as the ultimate source, though through a "Zwischenquelle", perhaps Nicolaus of Damascus.

<sup>(55)</sup> Josephus, *Bell. Iud.*, I 39 and *Ant. Iud.* XII 7,6.

<sup>(56)</sup> The man receives no name, but merely the title "phylarch". Occasionally, scholars took φυλάρχης as a personal name — Phylarches — (e.g. BEVENOT, *Makkabäerbücher*, 211; GRIMM, *II Buch*, 144; BUNGE, *Untersuchungen*, 280, still considers taking it as a name), but the name is generally φυλάρχος: φυλάρχης usually denotes a rank — see HABICHT, *II Makkabäerbuch*, 242; ABEL, *Livres*, 394. Conceivably, however, we should not translate "cavalry commander" (as does Habicht following, e.g., Hdt. V 69) but rather "tribal chieftain, sheik" — see esp. Strabo, XVI 1, 28, p. 748 (though here the form is indeed φυλάρχος); cf. H. BENGTSSEN, *Die Strategie in der Hellenistischen Zeit* (München 1952) III, 304; BAR-KOCHVA, *Judas*, 511. The correct translation of τὸν φυλάρχην τῶν περὶ Τιμόθεον ἀνέϊλον would then read "they slew the sheik who was with Timothy" — referring, perhaps, to the head of a clan of Bedouin whom Timothy had persuaded or hired to fight on his side (cf. 1 Macc 5,39; 2 Macc 10,24 and 12,10).

which tell of the humiliation which Nicanor, another enemy of God, had received. Unfortunately, the content of vv. 34-36 follows naturally on from v. 29 after which the story had shifted away from Nicanor for four verses<sup>(57)</sup>.

Let us sum up the foregoing: Chap. 8 down to v. 29 tells of Nicanor and his eventual defeat; by content vv. 34-36 belong with vv. 1-29. Vv. 30-32 and 33 are connected both by content and by theme; and the theme continues into vv. 34-36. Nothing, however, connects vv. 30-33 with what precedes them<sup>(58)</sup>. We can surely now see both that vv. 30-33 have been inserted into the story of Nicanor and what motivated their insertion at that point: after their insertion the same thematic thread ran from vv. 30-33 straight through vv. 34-36. The grafting in of vv. 30-33 shews some rhyme and reason, then, even if the graft itself remains obvious owing to the interruption of the contextually connected preceding and following verses. Presumably the Epitomator inserted vv. 30-33 himself; and then included the cross-references at 9,3 and 10,24<sup>(59)</sup>. We shall return to this in the next section.

#### 4. *The Historical Context of the Campaigns*

We now come to the most difficult problem: dating and placing the various campaigns against Timothy into their proper historical context. In 1 Maccabees, as we noted at the beginning, all these campaigns — including various other campaigns against the “neighbouring peoples” — are grouped together as though they belonged together chronologically and are placed between the Purification of the Temple and the death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. In 2 Maccabees the first campaign against Timothy stands before the Purification and Epiphanes' death; while all the other campaigns come after those two events. Moreover, in 2 Maccabees this latter grouping of campaigns is split into two groups: one before the first campaign of Lysias; and a second after that campaign.

<sup>(57)</sup> BUNGE, *Untersuchungen*, 277, has suggested a slightly more complicated variation on the idea adumbrated in the text, namely that the original sequence of verses at the end of chapter 8 was as follows: 21-24 then 34-35 and finally 25-29. He may well be right, but our argument remains unaffected.

<sup>(58)</sup> See also SIEVERS, *Hasmoneans*, 52 n. 29.

<sup>(59)</sup> It fits with what we know of the Epitomator that he maintained an awareness of the alterations he made and that he took care to follow through with consequential changes in the remainder of the narrative: PARKER, *Campaigns* (in press).



According to 1 Maccabees, however, Lysias' first campaign belongs to the period immediately preceding Antiochus IV's death. As I hope to have shewn elsewhere, that dating is correct: the different order of events in 2 Maccabees is predicated, however, not on a shifting of Lysias' campaign forwards, but rather on a shifting of Antiochus IV's death backwards in time<sup>(60)</sup>. Briefly, in 2 Maccabees an undated letter of Antiochus V Eupator (11,22b-26) is misunderstood as following upon a letter of the general Lysias, whose letter (11,16b-21) in turn bears the date "Year 148" — i.e. of the official Seleucid Era which began in October of 312 B.C. The 148<sup>th</sup> year corresponds to the period Oct. 165-Sept. 164. Now, Antiochus V Eupator did not ascend the throne until December of 164 B.C.; but the Epitomator (who, in my opinion, is responsible for adding (and interpreting) the letters in question to Jason's work — and hence: for carrying out any editorial rearrangement consequent upon their addition) did not know this and therefore assumed that Antiochus IV had died a year earlier than he actually did so that Antiochus V's letter could fall into the 148<sup>th</sup> year. Accordingly, the Epitomator transferred both Antiochus IV's death and the nearly contemporaneous Purification back one year and thus brought Lysias' first Judaeian campaign into the reign of Antiochus V. Hence 2 Maccabees places two years between the suppression of worship in the Temple and the Purification (10,3) — in contrast to the three years in 1 Maccabees which preserves an unaltered placement of Antiochus IV's death as coming after Lysias' first campaign (1,54 and 4,52).

We have gone through this exactly to the following end: The Epitomator moved not Lysias' first campaign so that it came to rest between the campaign against Timothy in chap. 10 and that in chap. 12<sup>(61)</sup> — i.e. splitting up what had originally stood together — but rather Antiochus IV's death so that it came to rest before Lysias' first campaign and, it follows, before the campaign against Timothy in chap. 10. The Epitomator had to decide how far back in his narrative to transfer the death and chose a position before the last mentioned campaign. If this be correct, then Lysias' first campaign clearly separated the two pertinent campaigns against Timothy already in Jason of Cyrene's work.

<sup>(60)</sup> For the opposite view see the next note.

<sup>(61)</sup> SCHUNK, *Quellen*, 110-111, argued that the Epitomator left 8,30-33 behind when he transferred Lysias' first campaign to the reign of Antiochus V. Cf. LAQUEUR, *Untersuchungen*, 43.

Once he had transferred Antiochus IV's death, as well as the Purification, it only remained for the Epitomator to make sure that he achieved proper transitions both before and after. The latter was easier: he had only to note that now Antiochus V Eupator was King (thus 2 Macc 10,10). The former presented the greater challenge since the Epitomator needed to transfer some material relating to the entry into (and presumably capture) of Jerusalem so as to explain Judas' presence there to carry out the Purification. We have already seen that chap. 8,30-33 — which deal with precisely that — have been secondarily inserted into their current position just before the Purification and Antiochus IV's death. In fact, precisely because these verses told of Judas' entry into Jerusalem, they had to be transferred along with the Purification<sup>(62)</sup>. We have already discussed how the Epitomator grafted the verses into the story of Nicanor's defeat in chap. 8 and then made sure to refer to it at 9,3 and 10,24.

We may postulate then the following order of events in 2 Maccabees before the Epitomator rearranged them (we add, for convenience sake, suggested dates in years B.C.):

- |                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| 165                      | Gorgias' and Nicanor's campaign in Judaea against Judas; Judas defeats them at Emmaus (2 Macc 8,9-29.34-36)   |
| Late 165 or<br>Early 164 | Judas fights against the Idumaeans and Timothy (2 Macc 10,24-38)  |
| 164                      | Lysias himself takes the field against Judas and Judas wards off his attack (2 Macc 11,1-15); thereafter Judas fights again against Timothy (2 Macc 8,30-32); towards the end of the year Judas enters Jerusalem and punishes Callisthenes (2 Macc 8,33); Antiochus IV dies (2 Macc 9); Judas purifies the Temple (2 Macc 10,1-8) |
| Early 163                | Judas again fights Timothy and the Idumaeans (2 Macc 12,10-31)  |
| 163                      | Lysias invades Judaea a second time (2 Macc 13,1-26)  |

(62) BUNGE, *Untersuchungen*, 277-279, has seen that verses 8,30-33 have been transferred in order to make some sort of a transition to what follows, yet he fails to say how they do this. In BUNGE's view, the Epitomator was responsible for transposing chap. 9 (the account of Antiochus IV's death) from after 10,8 to where it now stands. Yet verses 8,30-33 clearly account for Judas' presence in Jerusalem. That is to say, their own presence at the end of chapter 8 presupposes that Judas is about to do something in Jerusalem; and that can only mean the Purification. That is to say, the person who grafted verses 8,30-33 into their current place was not responsible for transposing chap. 9 and 10,1-8. (See above nn. 10, 44).

This table shews a certain amount of repetition, repetition which has always struck scholars as problematic. Wellhausen, for example, declared the campaigns against the Idumaeans and Timothy in 164 a doublet of those in 163; Kolbe felt the same about the two campaigns of Lysias<sup>(63)</sup>. Nonetheless, the genuine letters of Lysias and Antiochus V attest two distinct campaigns of Lysias<sup>(64)</sup>, so we should not hasten to call the other repeated campaigns doublets. After all, it lay in the nature of such a rebellion as Judas' that several raids into Idumaea or Gilead should take place or that an enemy commander should invade twice<sup>(65)</sup>. Finally, the repetition is present both in 1 and 2 Maccabees — i.e. it belongs, conventionally, to these books' shared source material and thus to the earliest identifiable layer of transmission. The difference in the two books' presentation resides in 1 Maccabees' grouping all the campaigns against the neighbouring peoples together, immediately after the account of the Purification; whereas 2 Maccabees (both originally and in the Epitomator's rearrangement) splits them up with some before and some after the Purification.

Which arrangement has the greater claim to historicity? Niese, who first broke a lance for 2 Maccabees in this question advanced one negative argument against 1 Maccabees (the arrangement there betrays literary patterning)<sup>(66)</sup> and one positive one in favour of 2 Maccabees:

<sup>(63)</sup> WELLHAUSEN, *Wert*, 149; KOLBE, *Beiträge*, 79-81.

<sup>(64)</sup> The (genuine) letter of Lysias at 2 Macc 11,16b-21 attests negotiations between Lysias and Jewish rebels in the 148<sup>th</sup> year of the official Seleucid era (i.e. Oct. 165 to Sept. 164 B.C.) and thus, *a priori*, fighting betwixt Lysias and the rebels during the main campaigning season of 164. The letter of Antiochus V Eupator at 2 Macc 11,22b-26 fits exactly into the context of Lysias' second campaign as described in 1 Macc 6 (see esp. 6, v. 59,62 and compare 2 Macc 11,25) and corroborates that book's account of the negotiations as well as, by extension, the historicity of that second campaign. See PARKER, *Campaigns* (in press).

<sup>(65)</sup> In fact, in respect of the two campaigns against the Idumaeans, two different groups of people may be involved: 1 Maccabees distinguishes between the Idumaeans "in Acrabattene" (1 Macc 5,3) and those in "the land of the South" in and around Hebron (1 Macc 5,65). If we accept 1 Maccabees' distinction, and the Acrabattene — as HÖLSCHER, "Bemerkungen", 133-134, suggests — lay in the North, then Judas' two Idumaeon campaigns had nothing to do with each other save that each took place near Judaea.

<sup>(66)</sup> NIESE, *Kritik*, 471-472. 1 Macc 5,1-2 deliberately recalls Neh 4,1.7 and Ezra 4,1 both in wording and (esp. Ezra) in theme: Judas' actions to restore the practice of the Jews' religion evokes the immediate hostility of their neighbours. This thematic interpretation of Judas' wars against the nations round about distinguishes 1 Maccabees sharply from 2 Maccabees which does not venture any

small, repetitive campaigns in and around Judaea ought to have accompanied the rebellion throughout<sup>(67)</sup>. Both arguments retain their force and have yet to receive refutation. But we may adduce farther ones.

First, it has puzzled scholars why Judas, after his defeat of Lysias in 164 B.C., long before the campaigning season ended<sup>(68)</sup>, should have waited until December to purify the Temple. If we posit the original arrangement of material in 2 Maccabees as correct, then an answer immediately suggests itself: Judas still had seasonal campaigns on his hands — against Timothy. In addition he still had to take Jerusalem itself. The ingenuity expended by Goldstein in explaining the long delay between Lysias' defeat and the Purification may all be in vain<sup>(69)</sup>: Judas was busy fighting during those months, nothing more.

Second, according to 2 Maccabees various campaigns against neighbours preceded Lysias' second invasion of Judaea. Curiously, 1 Maccabees presents this second invasion — which it places into the 150<sup>th</sup> year, i.e. in, regardless of which Seleucid era is meant, the campaigning season of 162 B.C.<sup>(70)</sup>: i.e. distinctly later than Antiochus IV's death<sup>(71)</sup> — as precipitated by the complaints which Jewish renegades bring to Antiochus V's court. Amongst other things these renegades complain that Judas and his men have been attacking the peoples on the borders of Judaea: καὶ οὐκ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς μόνον ἐξέτειναν χεῖρα ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ὅρια αὐτῶν, "and they have been attacking not just us, but all their neighbours too"<sup>(72)</sup>. Repeated

---

such overarching theme in its presentation of these events. The imposition of an overarching theme may — as Niese suggests — have first required the bringing together of all the campaigns. At any rate, while we can conclude that some literary patterning of events has taken place in 1 Maccabees, we cannot safely determine its limit.

<sup>(67)</sup> NIESE, *Kritik*, 471-472; cf. GALLING, *Judäa*, 46.

<sup>(68)</sup> Lysias' breaking off of the campaign after becoming bogged down at Beth Zur suggests that the campaign ended early (1 Macc 4,28-35; 2 Macc 11,1-12).

<sup>(69)</sup> GOLDSTEIN, *1 Maccabees*, 273-278.

<sup>(70)</sup> 1 Macc 6,20. (For the two Seleucid eras see BICKERMANN, *Festbrief*, 144).

<sup>(71)</sup> That is to say that despite 1 Maccabees' apparent dating of the campaign against the neighbours to before Antiochus IV's death (1 Macc 5), such fighting seems to have continued after the King's death even according to the chronology advanced by 1 Maccabees (faulty though it be: cf. PARKER, *Campaigns* [in press]) for Lysias' second campaign.

<sup>(72)</sup> 1 Macc 6,25.

fighting between the Jewish rebels and their neighbours would, in fact, provide excellent grounds for Lysias — despite his negotiated settlement of 164 B.C. <sup>(73)</sup> — to invade Judaea once more.

Finally, we may also suggest that Judas was not likely to engage in raids into Idumaea or the Transjordan when a large Seleucid army was in Judaea to concentrate his mind wonderfully. Precisely when Judas was thus occupied, of course, his hostile neighbours may well have seen their chance to settle old scores without fear of reprisal <sup>(74)</sup>. Therefore it should not surprise that as soon as Judas had warded off a major Seleucid force, he began to campaign in the surrounding areas against these enemies. Small-scale fighting — whether ignoble (retaliatory?) plundering raids <sup>(75)</sup> or somewhat nobler attempts to rescue harried fellow Jews — was thus not only feasible solely in the absence of large Seleucid armies <sup>(76)</sup>, but ought also to have flared precisely then. Frankly we should expect such fighting to ebb and flow according to major Seleucid campaigns: the repetitive character of battles against the same foes all over again finds therein its most natural explanation.

Univ. of Canterbury – Dept. of Classics  
Private Bag 4800  
Christchurch; New Zealand

VICTOR L. PARKER

#### SUMMARY

Both 1 and 2 Maccabees mention various campaigns of Judas Maccabaeus against an opponent called Timothy. The author argues that although 1 Maccabees in several instances does provide more accurate detail, 2 Maccabees' presentation of these campaigns as chronologically discrete has the greater historical plausibility. Additionally, 2 Maccabees alone preserves a record of a third, historically plausible campaign against Timothy. Overall, 2 Maccabees deserves more esteem as an historical source than it commonly receives.

<sup>(73)</sup> 2 Macc 11,13-15,16b-21.

<sup>(74)</sup> We should not underestimate the depth of hostility between neighbouring peoples with a long and common history of border disputes and familial feuds. While many things might reignite such disputes, the opportunity to kick an opponent when he was down, in accordance with the dictates of the baser instincts of human nature, surely provided an irresistible temptation.

<sup>(75)</sup> We need not minimise Judas' need to finance the rebellion, and plunder could easily have played a rôle.

<sup>(76)</sup> Cf. GALLING, "*Judäa*", 43.

## **Sach 5,5-11 – Die Unrechtmäßigkeit wird an ihren Ort verwiesen <sup>(1)</sup>**

Das Thema des siebten Nachtgesichts ist die Fortschaffung von Schuld (עון)<sup>(2)</sup> und Unrechtmäßigkeit (רשעה) nach Sinear. Die Bilder, die den Vorgang beschreiben, haben je für sich kaum atl. Parallelen, in dieser Kombination sind sie einzigartig. Die Bildelemente, das Efa, die Frau und die geflügelten Frauen sowie deren Deutungen werden einander kunstvoll zugeordnet. Es ergibt sich daraus ein Erzählfaden, der viele Fragen offen läßt, jedoch das “Was”, nämlich die Schuld (עון) bzw. die Unrechtmäßigkeit (רשעה) und das “Wohin”, nämlich Sinear pointiert herausstreicht.

Das Nachtgesicht ist als ein Dialog zwischen Sacharja und dem Engel, der mit ihm redete, gestaltet. Visionsschilderung und Deutung einzelner Visionselemente greifen ineinander bis dahin, daß der Deuteengel in das Bildgeschehen eingreifen kann. In formaler Hinsicht erweist sich die Vision dennoch als unausgewogen. Daher sollen Fragen, ein mögliches sekundäres Wachstum der Vision betreffend, in Form von literarkritischen Vorüberlegungen besprochen werden. Auf dieser Basis gilt es im zweiten Teil festzustellen, inwiefern sich eine Grundfassung der Vision vom Efa in den Kontext der Nachtgesichte Sacharjas einfügt und wie die Ergänzungen die Lesart erweitern und verändern. Der dritte Abschnitt ist, durch das Thema der Vision vorgegeben, auf die Besonderheiten des Vorgangs des Entferns von Schuld und Unrechtmäßigkeit aus dem Land, wie auch auf die Einzigartigkeit des Ortes, an den sie gebracht werden, ausgerichtet. Bezüge zu den anderen Nachtgesichten Sacharjas werden besonders unter dieser Perspektive hergestellt.

### *1. Literarkritische Vorüberlegungen*

Die Nachtgesichte Sacharjas unterliegen keinem strengen Formular, so daß eine literarkritische Scheidung allein anhand formaler Vorgaben für die Gestalt einer visionären Schau nicht möglich ist. Die Struktur des Textes zeigt dennoch Auffälligkeiten im

<sup>(1)</sup> Erweiterte Fassung des Vortrages anlässlich des Habilitationskolloquiums an der Theologischen Fakultät der Georg-August-Universität Göttingen am 27. Juni 2005.

Erzählverlauf, die sich allein durch fehlende formale Bindung nicht erklären lassen. Die zweifache Rede des Engels in v. 6, die Unterbrechung der Vision durch eine Deutung in v. 8aα, die erneute jetzt formelhafte Visionseinleitung in v. 9 und die weit über die Fragestellung des Propheten hinausgehende Antwort des Deuteengels in v. 11 sind in ihrer Funktion für Text und Kontext zu befragen.

Der Deuteengel fordert den Propheten zur Aufmerksamkeit auf. Es folgt jedoch keine Beschreibung des Wahrgenommenen, sondern sogleich die Frage, um was es sich denn hier handele. Anders sieht dies in v. 9 aus, da der Prophet wie auch in den anderen Nachtgesichten zunächst das Geschaute beschreibt. Einen direkten Übergang von v. 5 zu v. 9 anzunehmen, empfiehlt sich jedoch nicht, da die in v. 9 geschilderte Vision ohne die zuvor erfolgte Erklärung, daß es um das Efa gehe und daß das Efa die Unrechtmäßigkeit sei, unverständlich bleibt. Die Besonderheit dieser Vision, daß der Prophet das zunächst Gesehene nicht selbst beschreibt, sondern dies dem Deuteengel überläßt, bleibt bestehen<sup>(2)</sup>. Doch erhöht die jetzige Gestalt des Dialogs die Spannung der Hörer und Leser. Der Prophet weiß nicht einmal selbst den Gegenstand, den er sieht, einzuordnen. Das Außergewöhnliche des Gegenstandes ist, aufgrund von Beschreibung und Erklärung durch den Engel, deutlich kenntlich gemacht.

<sup>(2)</sup> יַעֲזֹר, so der MT, ist an dieser Stelle schwer verständlich. Die Versuche, dem MT dennoch einen Sinn zu entnehmen, sind vielfältig und werden dadurch erschwert, daß das Suffix der 3.m.pl. im Text kein Bezugswort hat. Häufig wird mit "ihr Aussehen" übersetzt (so u.a. H.-G. SCHÖTTLER, *Gott inmitten seines Volkes*. Die Neuordnung des Gottesvolkes nach Sacharja 1–6 (TThSt 43; Trier 1987) 134–135.; C. MEYERS – E. MEYERS, *Haggai, Zechariah 1–8* (AB 25b; Garden City, NY 1987) 293, 297). Nach C. Uehlinger handelt es sich um den Anblick der Frau ("Die Frau im Efa [Sach 5,5–11]", *BiKi* 49 [1994] 95); s.a. L.G. RIGNELL, *Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharja: eine exegetische Studie* (Lund-Gleerup 1950) 190; M. BİÇ, *Das Buch Sacharja* (Berlin 1962) 69. Einen Eingriff in den Text, wie die Übersetzungen der LXX und der Peschitta nahelegen, lehnt er ab. Doch die Annahme, daß hier ein schlichter Schreibfehler vorliegt, ist bei der großen Nähe des Schriftbildes von י and י nicht von der Hand zu weisen. S.a. J. WELLHAUSEN, *Die kleinen Propheten* (Berlin 1963) 184; K. SEYBOLD, *Bilder zum Tempelbau*. Die Visionen des Propheten Sacharja (SBS 70; Stuttgart 1974) 28; F.-J. STENDEBACH, *Prophetie und Tempel*. Haggai – Sacharja – Maleachi – Joel (SKK AT 16; Stuttgart 1977) 35; R. HANHART, *Sacharja 1–8* (BK.AT XIV/7.1; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1998) 353; A. BEHRENS, *Prophetische Visionsschilderungen im Alten Testament* (AOAT 292; Münster 2002) 285.

<sup>(3)</sup> Anders u.a. K. ELLIGER, *Die Propheten: Nahum, Habakuk, Zephania, Haggai, Sacharja, Maleachi* (ATD 25; Göttingen 1967) 106) und SCHÖTTLER, *Gott inmitten seines Volkes*, 140.



Erweist sich die Verlagerung von Beschreibung des Gesehenen und dessen Deutung – woraus sich auch der doppelte Redeeinsatz erklärt – auf den Engel als sinnvoll, so bleibt mit Blick auf v. 6 dennoch die Frage, in welchem Verhältnis die Deutung des Efas zur Deutung der Frau im Efa steht?

Sind die vv. 5-6 als eine Einleitung zu verstehen, die das Efa ins Zentrum rücken, so folgt mit den vv. 7-9 die eigentliche Visionsschilderung, unterbrochen durch die Deutung in v. 8a $\alpha$ . Die Unterbrechung der Visionsschilderung ist literarkritisch auffällig. Es spricht jedoch einiges dagegen, die Deutung auf die Unrechtmäßigkeit im Vergleich zu “ihre Schuld” als sekundär zu betrachten. Der Text ist von Femininformen durchzogen, so daß die רשעה (f.sg.) anders als ען (m.sg.) durchaus ihren Platz hat. Zudem paßt רשעה in einen von Rechtsverstößen geprägten Kontext, wie ihn auch die Vision von der fliegenden Schriftrolle vorgibt. Im Vergleich zu רשעה erweitert “ihre Schuld im ganzen Land” die Vision inhaltlich und verbindet sie mit der späteren Vision von der Einsetzung Josuas.

Ist also die Deutung nicht sekundär, so ist die unterbrochene Visionsschilderung von der Frau im Efa daraufhin zu befragen (vv. 7-8), denn das Efa steht ab v. 9 wieder allein im Zentrum. Es legt sich der Versuch nahe, den Text ohne die Hinweise auf die Frau im Efa zu lesen, und die Deutung רשעה (v. 8a $\alpha$ ) auf das in v. 6 genannte Efa zu beziehen. Unter dieser Perspektive ergibt sich eine Vision, die das Efa benennt, es als רשעה deutet und von geflügelten Frauen nach Sinear bringen läßt. Darüberhinaus wird auch die über die Frage des Propheten nach dem Bestimmungsort des Efa (v. 10) hinausgehende Antwort des Engels (v. 11) verständlich. Sie hat erst in der Endfassung auch die Ergänzung durch die Frau im Blick. Die angenommene Grundversion<sup>(4)</sup> schließt hingegen mit folgenden Worten des Propheten: “Und er sagte zu mir: Im Land Sinear stellt man es (dort) auf”. Die verbleibenden Angaben von v. 11 beziehen sich auf den Bau eines Tempels<sup>(5)</sup> und die Errichtung eines Sockels. Sie sagen mehr als Sacharja gefragt hat und lassen sich gut im Zusammenhang mit einer späteren Einfügung der Vision der Frau im Efa verstehen<sup>(6)</sup>.

<sup>(4)</sup> Zur Überarbeitung gehören folglich vv. 6b $\beta$ .7.8a $\beta$ .b.11\*.

<sup>(5)</sup> “Und man befestigt es (das Haus)...”. Die Form 3.m.sg. Perf. Hof. bezieht sich auf das zu bauende Haus, das befestigt wird, nicht jedoch auf das Efa oder die Frau.

<sup>(6)</sup> Vgl. SCHÖTTLER, *Gott inmitten seines Volkes*, 139-140) und R.G. KRATZ, “Serubbabel und Joschua”, *Das Judentum im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels* (FAT 42; Tübingen 2004) 86-87.

## 2. Das Efa und die Frau im Efa

Verschiedene Einzelbeobachtungen legen es nahe, daß die Frau, die mit ihr verbundenen Bildelemente sowie die entsprechende Deutung nachträglich in eine Vision vom Efa, das nach Sinear gebracht und dort aufgestellt wird, eingefügt worden sind.

Die Grundvision beschreibt das Efa, das von zwei geflügelten Frauengestalten gefaßt und zwischen Erde und Himmel weggetragen wird. Den Äußerungen des Engels nach handelt es sich bei dem Efa um die Unrechtmäßigkeit (רשעה). Die Motive lassen ein Spektrum an Deutungen zu, die von der konkreten Anklage des Efa bis zur Versinnbildlichung allgemeiner Mißstände im Efa reichen. Das Efa ist ein Getreidemaß, das sowohl zu kultischen als auch zu profanen Zwecken einzusetzen ist. Als Maßeinheit kann es mißbraucht werden. Das vorausgehende Nachtgesicht von der fliegenden Schriftrolle (Sach 5,1-4) wird in der Anklage von Mißständen sehr konkret. Diebe und Meineidige, als Gefährder der Besitzverhältnisse und damit Verursacher sozialer Unruhe, werden unter einen Fluch gestellt<sup>(7)</sup>. Aus dieser Perspektive ist auch das Nachtgesicht vom Efa als konkrete Anklage gegen den Mißbrauch von Maßen aufzufassen<sup>(8)</sup>. Da zudem kein Inhalt für das Efa genannt wird, steht dieses selbst in der Kritik. Daß in der Vision das Efa außer Landes gebracht wird, bedeutet folglich Anklage des Mißbrauchs von Maßen und gleichzeitig Beseitigung dieses Mißstandes.

Der Deuteengel sagt über das Efa: das ist die רשעה, die Unrechtmäßigkeit. Dieser Ausdruck gehört, in semantischer Opposition zu צדקה, in den Bereich der Existenz wider die göttliche Ordnung. רשעה umfaßt grundsätzlich mehr Mißstände als den falschen Gebrauch von Maßen. Bild und Deutung des Nachtgesichtes fügen jedoch beide Aspekte zusammen. In diesem Falle ist das Efa die רשעה. Die Nachtgesichte von der fliegenden Schriftrolle und vom Efa zeigen auf unterschiedliche Weise die Beseitigung von Übel. Während jedoch in

<sup>(7)</sup> Dtn 28,15-68; 29,19-28; Lev 26,14-39. Vgl. auch W. RUDOLPH, *Haggai – Sacharja 1–8 – Sacharja 9–14 – Maleachi* (KAT XIII/4; Gütersloh 1976) 117; MEYERS – MEYERS, *Haggai*, 283.

<sup>(8)</sup> Vgl. Mich 6,11 sowie Lev 19,36; Dtn 25,13-15; Ez 45,10; Am 8,5; Spr 20,10. S.a. L. ROST, "Erwägungen zu Sacharjas 7. Nachtgesicht", ZAW NF 17(1940/41) 226-227; U. SALS, *Die Biographie der "Hure Babylon"* (FAT II/6; Tübingen 2004) 178. Anders RUDOLPH, *Haggai*, 119. B.C. OLLENBURGER, *Zechariah* (NIB; Nashville 1996) VII, 778-779 verknüpft das Efa und seinen Deckel mit den Steueraufgaben durch die Perser.

der sechsten Vision einzelne bestraft werden, geht die siebte Vision weit darüber hinaus. Mit dem Fortbringen der Unrechtmäßigkeit werden grundsätzlich neue Verhältnisse im Land geschaffen.

Das Efa wird in das Land Sinear gebracht. Wiederherstellung der Ordnung im Land geschieht hier durch Entfernen des Übels. Diese Konzeption ist auf dem Hintergrund von Eliminationsriten zu verstehen, wie sie auch im Sühnekult Israels durchgeführt werden. Über die kultischen Texte hinaus geht jedoch das konkrete Ziel: das Land Sinear, Wiege menschlicher Überheblichkeit und mangelnder Gottesfurcht. Die Gleichsetzung Sinears mit Babylon, dem Land des Exils, ist allerdings schwierig. Es geht in Sach 5,5-11 um Wiederherstellung von Ordnung und nicht um Strafe an Babylon, indem die zerstörerische Macht dort aufgestellt wird<sup>(9)</sup>. Die Wahl des Namens Sinear verweist auf eine Zeit weit vor dem babylonischen Exil. Sie verweist auf grundlegende Ereignisse der Menschheitsgeschichte, auf das Land, wo sich die Menschen zusammentaten, um sich selbst zu erhöhen, indem sie einen Turm bauten. Ein Blick auf die Nachtgesichte von Reitern bzw. von Wagen und Pferden (Sach 1,8-15; 6,1-8) stützt diese Sicht. Gottes Geist durchzieht die ganze Erde, und das Land des Nordens ist dabei in besonderer Weise im Blick (Sach 6,8). Etwas anders sieht dies mit dem späteren Zusatz in Sach 2,10-17<sup>(10)</sup> aus, der die Exilierten auffordert, aus Babel — hier ist es konkret benannt — zu fliehen. Erst dieser Text bringt eine von den Nachtgesichten abweichende Perspektive auf Babel ein.

Ebenso wie das Efa, ohne Aufschluß über das "Woher" zu geben, erschienen ist, erscheinen auch die zwei geflügelten Frauen. Ihnen obliegt allein der Transport des Efa. Mischwesen, in diesem Falle teils Mensch, teils Vogel, sind auch über diesen Text hinaus in der biblischen Überlieferung anzutreffen<sup>(11)</sup>. Variationen sind möglich, doch eine geschlechtliche Spezifizierung ist ungewöhnlich<sup>(12)</sup>. Die Frage bleibt, wieviel Gewicht dieser Besonderheit beizumessen ist. Der Text ist von zahlreichen Femininformen durchzogen. Nicht nur die

<sup>(9)</sup> So aber WELLHAUSEN, *Die kleinen Propheten*, 184; Anders auch H. GESE, "Anfang und Ende der Apokalyptik, dargestellt am Sacharjabuch", DERS., *Vom Sinai zum Zion* (BEvTh 64; München 1974) 219; C. JEREMIAS, *Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharja* (FRLANT 117; Göttingen u.a. 1977) 196; SALS, *Hure Babylon*, 167.

<sup>(10)</sup> Vgl. dazu RUDOLPH, *Haggai*, 89.

<sup>(11)</sup> Vgl. u.a. Jes 6,1-4; Ez 1,5-14; Ez 41,17-20a. Vgl. O. KEEL, *Jahwevisionen und Siegelkunst* (SBS 84/85; Stuttgart 1977) 192.

<sup>(12)</sup> Zur ikonographischen Verbreitung weiblicher Flügelgestalten vgl. F.A.M. WIGGERMANN, "Mischwesen A", *RLA* VIII, 239.

Frauen, auch die Störche, mit deren Flügeln die Flügel der Mischwesen verglichen werden, das Land, das Efa und die Unrechtmäßigkeit (רשעה) sind Feminina. Aus dieser Perspektive wird deutlich, daß die נשים, die Frauen sich ganz im Rahmen des Bildes bewegen. Die Maskulinformen gelten Sacharja und dem Deuteengel. Die Mischwesen sind als Frauen folglich auch von den Engeln, die in den Nachtgesichten erwähnt sind<sup>(13)</sup>, zu unterscheiden<sup>(14)</sup>. Damit ist jedoch nicht gesagt, daß sie negativ konnotiert sind<sup>(15)</sup>. Sie bewegen sich in der gleichen Sphäre zwischen "Erde und Himmel", wie der Engel Jhwhs nach 1 Chr 21,16 oder der entrückte Ezechiel nach Ez 8,3. Dennoch wird in der Forschung häufiger darauf verwiesen, daß Störche unreine Tiere seien, eine Qualität, die man auf die Frauen überträgt<sup>(16)</sup>. Doch ihre Aufgabe, die Unrechtmäßigkeit aus dem Land zu bringen, ist für Israel heilvoll<sup>(17)</sup> und sie führen sie mit רוח unter den Flügeln aus<sup>(18)</sup>. Das hebräische Wort für Storch ist חסידה. Der חסיד ist fromm, barmherzig und treu gegenüber Gott<sup>(19)</sup>. Die רשעה, die Unrechtmäßigkeit, wird durch Frauengestalten mit Flügeln der

<sup>(13)</sup> מלאך (Sach 1,8.10; 2,4.5); מלאך יהוה (Sach 1,11.12; 3,1.5.6); מלאך (Sach 3,3); המלאך הדבר בי (Sach 1,9.13.14; 2,2.7; 4,1.4.5; 5,5.10; 6,4.5). Vgl. K. SULLIVAN, *Wrestling with Angels* (AGJU 55; Leiden 2004) 82-83. S.a. E.S. GERSTENBERGER, "Boten, Engel, Hypostasen. Die Kommunikation Gottes mit dem Menschen", *Gott und Mensch im Dialog*, FS O. Kaiser (Hg. M. WITTE) (BZAW 345; Berlin u.a. 2004) I, 143.

<sup>(14)</sup> Vgl. JEREMIAS, *Nachtgesichte*, 199. Anders SALS, *Hure Babylon*, 191. Ikonographische Darstellungen lassen nur ein klares Muster für Mischwesen mit Flügeln erkennen. Sie sind in der Luft beheimatet und benötigen ihre Flügel, um ihrer Aufgabe in den Lüften nachzukommen (vgl. WIGGERMANN, "Mischwesen A", 241). S.a. RIGNELL, *Nachtgesichte*, 195.

<sup>(15)</sup> Vgl. u.a. A. KÖHLER, *Die Weissagungen Sacharjas erste Hälfte*, Cap 1-8 (Erlangen 1861) 177.

<sup>(16)</sup> Vgl. E. SELLIN, *Das Zwölfprophetenbuch* (KAT XII; Leipzig/Erlangen 1922) 462; D. RUDMAN, "Zechariah 5 and the Priestly Law", *SJOT* 14 (2000) 204-205.

<sup>(17)</sup> C. & E. Meyers vergleichen die Aufgabe der geflügelten Frauengestalten mit der der Schmiede (*Haggai*, 313; s.a. J.M. VINCENT, "L'appoint de la recherche historique et ses limites pour la compréhension des visions nocturnes de Zacharie", *Bib* 87 (2006) 23).

<sup>(18)</sup> Im Kontext vgl. Sach 6,5.8. Anders wiederum in den Epexegesen, so Sach 2,10.

<sup>(19)</sup> Vgl. Jer 8,7. UEHLINGER, "Die Frau im Efa", 97; K. MARTI, *Das Dodekapropheton* (KHC XIII; Tübingen 1904), 417; R. MASON, *The Books of Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi* (Cambridge Bible Commentary; Cambridge u.a. 1977) 58; BEHRENS, *Visionsschilderungen*, 286.

Gottestreue und Barmherzigkeit aus dem Land getragen. Ein Neuanfang ist durch diesen Vorgang für Israel garantiert.

Weshalb sollte die Vision aber nachträglich um die im Efa sitzende Frau ergänzt werden? Gemeinsam mit dem Bild der Frau sind weitere Aspekte in das Nachtgesicht eingetragen worden. Dazu gehört der Begriff עון, d.h. Schuld, der dem Kontext nach nun zur Deutung für das Efa wird. Mit עון wird gegenüber רשעה auf eine andere Qualität von Schuld verwiesen. רשע meint unrechtmäßiges, das Recht verdrehendes Handeln<sup>(20)</sup>. Der Begriff zielt auf die Haltung des Frevlers (רשע) gegenüber Gott (vgl. Mal 3,18) ebenso wie auf die daraus resultierende Tat, die Konsequenzen für die Gemeinschaft<sup>(21)</sup> hat. עון bezeichnet eine Schuldsphäre. Schuld betrifft das Gottesverhältnis, bedarf der Befreiung und Reinigung<sup>(22)</sup>. Anders als unrechtmäßiges Handeln, bezeichnet mit רשע oder רשעה, das der Umkehr bedarf<sup>(23)</sup> ist עון eine durch den Kult zu bewältigende Größe<sup>(24)</sup>. Das Ausmaß der Verfehlungen wird zudem durch die Formulierung "ihre Schuld im ganzen Land" angedeutet. Ganz Israel<sup>(25)</sup> steht unter dem Einfluß von Schuld (עון). Jeglicher Gedanke daran, daß die Verfehlungen sich allein auf den Mißbrauch von Maßen durch einzelne beziehen könnten, ist nun ausgeschlossen. Der Verweis auf das ganze Land (כל־הארץ) findet sich auch in Sach 5,3. Auf diese Weise wird ein Bezug zu den in Sach 5,1-4 angeklagten Verfehlungen her- und diese werden mit Sach 5,5-11 in einen erweiterten Kontext gestellt<sup>(26)</sup>. Standen in der Grundschrift Bestrafung von Fehlverhalten und Entfernen von Mißständen noch nebeneinander,

<sup>(20)</sup> Vgl. H. RINGGREN, "רשע", *ThWAT* VIII, 682; JEREMIAS, *Nachtgesichte*, 195. S.a. Dtn 9,4.5; 25,21; Ez 18,20.27; 33,12.19; Spr 13,6; Mal 3,15.19.

<sup>(21)</sup> Vgl. die Auswahl der Mißstände in Sach 5,1-4. Auch der ideale König liebt צדק und haßt רשע (Ps 45,8). S.a. RINGGREN, "רשע", 682.

<sup>(22)</sup> Vgl. עון und כפר in Lev 10,17; Jes 27,9; Spr 16,6.

<sup>(23)</sup> Vgl. Ez 18,19-29.

<sup>(24)</sup> Anders HANHART, *Sacharja*, 371, 373; vgl. ELLIGER, *Die Propheten*, 112. עון wird jedoch nur in Ps 89,32-33 mit der Übertretung göttlicher Satzungen in Verbindung gebracht. Vgl. K. KOCH, "עון", *ThWAT* V, 1167. Konkret ROST, "Erwägungen zu Sacharjas 7. Nachtgesicht", 226 mit Bezug zu Jer 14,20; s.a. OLLENBURGER, *Zechariah*, 779.

<sup>(25)</sup> HANHART, *Sacharja*, 339-340, 370 übersetzt mit "Erde". Vgl. zur Diskussion auch BİÇ, *Das Buch Sacharja*, 65; SALS, *Hure Babylon*, 169; OLLENBURGER, *Zechariah*, 777.

<sup>(26)</sup> Vgl. MASON, *Haggai*, 58. M. BİÇ stellt den Bezug zum vorhergehenden Nachtgesicht über das Suffix der 3.m.pl. ("ihre Schuld") her (*Das Buch Sacharja*, 69; s.a. SCHÖTTLER, *Gott inmitten seines Volkes*, 134-135). Anders UEHLINGER, "Die Frau im Efa", 95.

bietet nun die siebte Vision den übergeordneten Rahmen für die sechste; denn "ihre Schuld im ganzen Land" soll entfernt werden.

Nicht nur die Deutung des Efa ändert sich mit der Zufügung. Es bekommt auch eine andere Funktion. Das Efa wird vom Bild der Unrechtmäßigkeit zum Behältnis für die Unrechtmäßigkeit, dargestellt in der Figur der Frau. Die Gefährlichkeit des Inhalts des Efa wird durch eine Besonderheit dieses Nachtgesichts vermittelt. Der Deuteengel greift in das Visionsgeschehen ein. Ohne daß von einer Bewegung der Frau die Rede gewesen wäre, heißt es, daß der Deuteengel sie mitten ins Efa stößt und dieses mit einem Bleideckel verschließt. Der Deckel, nun ein Stein von Blei, wird zu einem unüberwindlichen Hindernis<sup>(27)</sup>.

Daß die Unrechtmäßigkeit personifiziert und in der Gestalt einer Frau dargestellt wird, hat ein ganzes Spektrum verschiedener Deutungen hervorgerufen, von der Annahme, daß hier ein direkter Rückgriff auf den Sündenfall und die Schuld der Frau als Verführerin<sup>(28)</sup>, verbunden mit Spekulationen über ihre Schönheit<sup>(29)</sup>, vorliege bis dahin, daß eine oder die Göttin<sup>(30)</sup> außer Landes gebracht werden soll. Alternativ dazu steht die Deutung der Frau als Personifikation von Schuld, als Darstellung einer abstrakten Größe, wie u.a. auch die Weisheit als Frau vorgestellt werden kann<sup>(31)</sup>. Nach

<sup>(27)</sup> Zu Gefäßen mit Bleideckel in kathartischen Ritualen vgl. V. HAAS, "Ein hurritischer Blutritus und die Deponierung der Ritualrückstände nach hethitischen Quellen", *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Kleinasien, Nordsyrien und dem Alten Testament* (Hg. B. JANOWSKI) (OBO 129; Freiburg – Göttingen 1993) 79, 82-83.

<sup>(28)</sup> Vgl. RUDOLPH, *Haggai*, 120; ELLIGER, *Die Propheten*, 112.

<sup>(29)</sup> Vgl. M. HALLER, *Das Judentum* (Göttingen 1925) 104; K. Koch hingegen nennt sie "ein häßlich Weib" (*Die Profeten II. Babylonisch-perische Zeit* [Stuttgart u.a. 1980] 172).

<sup>(30)</sup> Nach Uehlinger als Figurine ("Die Frau im Efa", 94-95; vgl. auch OLLENBURGER, *Zechariah*, 777-778; M.J. BODA, "Terrifying the Horns: Persia and Babylon in Zechariah 1:7-6:15", *CBQ* 67 [2005] 27-28). S.a. MEYERS – MEYERS, *Haggai*, 297. Nach B.C. Ollenburger die Himmelskönigin des Jeremia (*Zechariah*, 779). F.-J. Stendebach erkennt sie, ähnlich C. UEHLINGER, *Figurative Policy, Propaganda und Prophetie*. Congress Volume Cambridge 1995 (Hg. J.A. EMERTON) (VT.S 66; Leiden 1997) 345, als Ishtar von Babel (*Prophetie*, 36). Vgl. dazu auch die Parallelen zwischen Sach 5,9 und Ez 8,3.

<sup>(31)</sup> Vgl. GESE, "Anfang und Ende der Apokalyptik, dargestellt am Sacharjabuch", 213; ROST, "Erwägungen zu Sacharjas 7. Nachtgesicht", 227; E. ACHTEMEIER, *Nahum-Maleachi* (Interpretation; Atlanta, GA 1986) 128; H. DELKURT, *Sacharjas Nachtgesichte*. Zur Aufnahme und Abwandlung prophetischer Tradition (BZAW 302; Berlin u.a. 2000) 269-270.

v. 11 soll der Frau im Lande Sinear ein Haus gebaut und sie soll auf ein Podest gestellt werden. Es ist kaum möglich, unter dem Haus etwas anderes als einen Tempel zu verstehen<sup>(32)</sup>. Das Podest wird dann zum Sockel der Götterstatue. Ob es sich bei der Frau tatsächlich um eine in Israel verehrte Göttin handelt oder um das personifizierte Schlechte, das nun in Sinear wie eine Göttin verehrt werden soll, läßt sich auch mit Blick auf v. 11 kaum sagen. Unter der Prämisse der Wiederherstellung göttlicher Ordnung im Lande ist beides möglich<sup>(33)</sup>.

In Jerusalem erhält Jhwh sein Haus (Sach 1,16), die Unrechtmäßigkeit jedoch in Sinear. Darin wird gern ein Platztausch gesehen. Jhwh kehre aus Babylon zurück während die רשעה dorthin gebracht werde. Doch muß nach Sacharja nicht Jhwh zurückkehren<sup>(34)</sup>, sondern das Volk. Zudem wird die Unrechtmäßigkeit nicht nach Babylon, sondern nach Sinear, dem Ursprungsort widergöttlichen Verhaltens, gebracht. Es ist der Ort, an dem die Menschheit versuchte, die Schranke zwischen Gott und Mensch aufzuheben<sup>(35)</sup>. Während Jhwh als Herrscher der Welt thront, steht die Unrechtmäßigkeit auf einem Sockel, wie die von DtJes verpönten Götzenbilder (s. Jes 44,13), in dem Land menschlicher Überheblichkeit. Der רשעה werden nicht Ehre und Anbetung, sondern Hohn und Spott zuteil<sup>(36)</sup>.

### 3. Die Entfernung von Schuld und das Ziel Sinear

Das siebte Nachtgesicht Sacharjas beschreibt in eindrücklichen Bildern die Befreiung Israels von Schuld und Unrechtmäßigkeit. Der

<sup>(32)</sup> Vgl. MASON, *Haggai*, 58. H. Delkurt liest die Passage im Kontext von Gen 11 (*Sacharjas Nachtgesichte*, 268). S.a. HANHART, *Sacharja*, 376.

<sup>(33)</sup> Vgl. dazu Jer 16,18 und auch 2 Chr 24,7. Andere Voraussetzungen nach Hos 10,5f.

<sup>(34)</sup> So vor allem H. Gese ("Anfang und Ende der Apokalyptik, dargestellt am Sacharjabuch", 219). In Sach 1,3 heißt es aber: "Kehrt um zu mir, Spruch Jhwh Zebaoths, und ich kehre um zu euch". S.a. Sach 1,16; 8,3: Jhwh hat sich Zion zugewandt. Vgl. auch P. MARINKOVIC, "Was wissen wir über den zweiten Tempel aus Sach 1-8?", *Konsequente Traditionsgeschichte*. FS K. Baltzer (Hg. R. BARTELMUS u.a.) (OBO 126; Göttingen – Freiburg, Schweiz 1993) 288).

<sup>(35)</sup> Vgl. auch RUDOLPH, *Haggai*, 120. Sinear (Gen 10,10; 11,2; 14,1.9; Jos 7,21; Jes 11,11; Dan 1,2) bezeichnet einen urzeitlichen Ort, der für "hochmütig-sündhaftes Tun" steht (vgl. DELKURT, *Sacharjas Nachtgesichte*, 266). Allein Dan 1,2 ist als Hinweis auf eine Gleichsetzung von Sinear mit dem Land des Exils zu lesen. Hier wird Sinear als historischer Ort verstanden, während er, auch in Sach 5, eine urzeitliche Größe ist. Anders BODA, "Terrifying the Horns: Persia and Babylon in Zechariah 1:7-6:15", 27-28.

<sup>(36)</sup> S.a. Ez 7,21. Vgl. BIÇ, *Das Buch Sacharja*, 78; RUDOLPH, *Haggai*, 121. Anders SALS, *Hure Babylon*, 193,196; ACHTEMEIER, *Nahum-Maleachi*, 129.



Vorgang selbst wie auch das für die Unrechtmäßigkeit (רשעה) gewählte Ziel sind aus alttestamentlicher Perspektive so ungewöhnlich, daß sie nun noch einmal genauer betrachtet werden sollen.

Mit dem Vorgang des Entferns von Schuld wird ein Konzept aufgenommen, das sich auch in den priesterlichen Sühneritualen wiederfindet, im Azazel-Ritus (Lev 16) sowie in den Blutriten gegen Aussatz (Lev 14,1-32.33-53). Nach Lev 16 wird ein Ziegenbock, nach Lev 14 wird ein mit Sühnblut besprengter Vogel fortgeschickt. Die stofflich gebundene Schuld bzw. Krankheit wird entfernt, weggebracht aus dem Bereich des Lebens.

Delkurt hat sich in einem im Jahr 2000 erschienenen Aufsatz sehr deutlich gegen jeglichen Bezug der Nachtgesichte Sacharjas zum priesterlichen Kult Israels ausgesprochen<sup>(37)</sup>. Er kritisiert eine Forschungsrichtung, die Sacharjas Verkündigung in eine Reihe mit dem Verfassungsentwurf Ezechiels und mit Haggai stellen will, und als das Hauptinteresse dieser prophetischen Texte den Tempelbau und die Wiedererrichtung des Tempelkultes definiert<sup>(38)</sup>. Delkurt untersucht einzelne Begriffe und Motive der Nachtgesichte und kommt in erster Linie aufgrund von mangelnder terminologischer Übereinstimmung zu dem besagten Urteil.

Nun ist ihm zumindest darin Recht zu geben, daß Sacharja kaum eine priesterlich-kultische Terminologie verwendet. Seine Folgerung: "Damit scheint Sacharja zwar nicht ausdrücklich, aber durch seine literarischen Techniken doch unverkennbar einen Gegenentwurf zu bestimmten priesterlichen Konzepten der frühnachexilischen Zeit zu entwerfen"<sup>(39)</sup>, geht jedoch in die falsche Richtung. Priesterlich-kultische Konzepte zeigen sich durchaus, in Bezug auf Sühnevorstellungen oder in Bezug auf die räumliche Wahrnehmung von Heiligkeit. Ihre Wandlung in prophetischer Rede ist kaum als Gegenentwurf zu bezeichnen, wenn er in erster Linie durch eine Verweigerung des Aufgreifens einer bestimmten Terminologie gekennzeichnet ist. So ist Delkurt entgegenzuhalten, daß prophetische

<sup>(37)</sup> Vgl. S.H. DELKURT, "Sacharja und der Kult", *Verbindungslinien*. FS W.H. Schmidt (Hg. A. GRAUPNER u.a.) (Neukirchen-Vluyn 2000) 39. S.a. RUDMAN, "Zechariah 5 and the Priestly Law", 196-198.

<sup>(38)</sup> Vgl. DELKURT, "Sacharja und der Kult", 28. Er bezieht sich u.a. auf SEYBOLD, *Bilder*, 107; G. SAUER, "Serubbabel in der Sicht Haggais und Sacharjas", *Das ferne und nahe Wort*. FS L. Rost (Hg. F. MAAS) (BZAW 105; Berlin 1977) 206.

<sup>(39)</sup> Vgl. DELKURT, "Sacharja und der Kult", 39.

Rede, die kultische Grundgedanken aufnimmt, nicht allein an einem Text wie dem Verfassungsentwurf des Ezechiel gemessen werden kann, der sich kultischer Terminologie bedient und ein eigenes Heiligtumskonzept entwickelt<sup>(40)</sup>. Das Verhältnis Sacharjas zum Kult aufgrund dieser Prämissen als "positiv" oder "negativ" zu beschreiben, ist der Sache nicht angemessen.

Die Vision von der Frau im Efa setzt einen Eliminationsritus in prophetische Schau um. Dem kultischen Vorgang wie auch der Schau ist gemeinsam, daß Schuld und Verfehlung stofflich und visuell wahrnehmbar entfernt werden. Sie werden durch einen Träger, ein Tier, oder, in diesem Fall das Efa<sup>(41)</sup>, transportabel und können somit weg aus der Sphäre des Lebens in die Sphäre des Chaos gebracht werden. Nach Lev 16 ist die Sphäre des Chaos die Wüste. Der Azazelbock wird in die Wüste geschickt und sein Zurückkommen verhindert. Das Ergebnis im Falle des Azazelritus ist, in Kombination mit anderen Sühneriten, kultische Reinheit und d.h. Fortdauer des Leben ermöglichenden Gottesdienstes. Im Falle des Vogelritus in Lev 14 ist es die Sühne bzw. Reinigung und Befreiung von Krankheit einer Person oder auch eines Gebäudes. Die Person kann wieder in die Gemeinschaft integriert, das Gebäude kann wieder seiner Bestimmung gemäß genutzt werden. Mit dem Forttragen der רשעה wird nach Sach 5,5-11 das Land befreit, schöpferische Ordnung hergestellt und Leben im Lande ermöglicht. Dabei läßt sich die Wüste des Azazelritus durchaus mit Sinear vergleichen, denn es geht nicht einfach um das Überschreiten von Landesgrenzen, sondern um den Übergang von Schöpfung zum Chaos. Dennoch liegt in der Wahl des Landes Sinear als konkretem Ziel für das Aufstellen der Unrechtmäßigkeit eine Besonderheit der prophetischen Verkündigung Sacharjas gegenüber der kultischen Konzeption. Priesterliche Sühnetheologie kennt zwar räumliche Abstufungen von Heiligkeit in Bezug auf den Tempel, die Stadt Jerusalem und das Land, doch sind für den Eliminationsritus in der Hauptsache das Innen und das Außen, Schöpfung und Chaos relevant. Sacharja stellt den Eliminationsritus jedoch in eine andere,

<sup>(40)</sup> Vgl. dazu auch S.S. TUELL, "Haggai-Zechariah: Prophecy after the Manner of Ezekiel", *Thematic Threads in the Book of the Twelve* (Hg. P.L. REDDITT u.a.) (BZAW 325; Berlin u.a. 2003) 279-280.

<sup>(41)</sup> Die parallele Verwendung eines Gefäßes zeigt sich u.a. in einem Brief an den assyrischen König Asarhaddon (680-669 v.Chr.) (vgl. HAAS, "Ein hurritischer Blutritus und die Deponierung der Ritualrückstände nach hethitischen Quellen", 79).

umfassende Perspektive. Die Befreiung von Schuld gilt Israel. Dennoch wird die Schuld nicht einfach über die Landesgrenze oder in die Wüste getragen. Sie wird an ihren in der Menschheitsgeschichte tief verankerten Ursprungsort gebracht<sup>(42)</sup>.

Für die Prophetie Sacharjas ist von Bedeutung, daß es sich bei dem Geschauten um einen einmaligen Akt handelt, der grundsätzlich neue Bedingungen schafft, während die Sühnerituale des priesterlichen Kultes auf Wiederholung angelegt sind. Das Land wird grundsätzlich von der *רשעה* befreit, sie geht an ihren Ursprungsort zurück. Eine neue, gerechte Ordnung wird dadurch im Lande geschaffen.

Mit der Überarbeitung wurde der Terminus *עון* in das Nachtgesicht eingetragen. Er ist, außer in Sach 5,6 innerhalb des Sacharjabuches nur noch im Kontext der Investitur Josuas (Sach 3,1-7.8-10; in den vv. 4.9) verwendet worden. Nach Sach 3,4 wird Josua zum Zeichen seiner Reinigung von Schuld (*עון*) mit neuen Gewändern eingekleidet. In der sich an die Vision anschließenden Verheißung des Knechts wird zugesagt, daß nicht nur, wie zuvor beschrieben, die Schuld Josuas beseitigt werden soll, sondern die des ganzen Landes – an einem Tag. Genau dies ist es, was nach Sach 5,5-11 geschieht, als einmaliger Akt.

Aus dieser Perspektive liest sich die Einfügung der Frau im Efa als eine notwendige Folge aus Sach 3,9. Doch ist das Verhältnis der beiden Texte nicht allein über das Stichwort *עון* zu klären. Während in Sach 3,9 von “der Schuld jenes Landes” die Rede ist, heißt es in Sach 5,6 “ihre Schuld im ganzen Land”. Das Pronominalsuffix der 3.m.pl. in Sach 5,6 verweist auf die Schuld jedes einzelnen. Jeder, der im Lande schuldig wird und damit gottgewollte Ordnung stört, ist angesprochen. Es scheint, als gäbe es zwischen den beiden Aussagen letztlich keinen Unterschied, denn im Ergebnis wird das Land von Schuld (*עון*) befreit. Doch während nach Sach 5,6 der Blick auf die Verfehlungen jedes einzelnen gerichtet ist, ist nach Sach 3,9 das Land selbst schuldig geworden. Stellt man die Passagen, in denen *עון* im Kontext der Nachtgesichte Sacharjas erwähnt wird, zusammen, so ergibt sich folgende Trias: Befreiung von Schuld (*עון*) sollen der Hohepriester<sup>(43)</sup>, das Land und das Volk erfahren. Aus redaktionsgeschichtlicher Perspektive liegt folglich die Annahme nahe, daß die

<sup>(42)</sup> S.a. DELKURT, *Sacharjas Nachtgesichte*, 269.

<sup>(43)</sup> Der Vorgang ist als eine Reinigung stellvertretend für das Volk zu verstehen (vgl. RIGNELL, *Nachtgesichte*, 142-143; JEREMIAS, *Nachtgesichte*, 208) und als eine Reinigung seiner Person (vgl. auch ELLIGER, *Die Propheten*, 121). S.a. Lev 4; 16.

Frau im Efa erst nach der Vision von der Einsetzung Josuas zum Hohenpriester eingearbeitet worden ist. Aus priesterlich-kultischer Perspektive vervollständigt dieser Zusatz einen wesentlichen Aspekt kultischer Konzeption. Schuld, wenn auch von einzelnen verantwortet, hat Auswirkungen auf die Ausübung des Kultes, hier durch die Person des Hohenpriesters aufgenommen, auf das Land und das Volk. Sie alle bedürfen kultischer Sühne oder, in der Terminologie des Sacharja, Befreiung von Schuld (עון).

Die Wahl der Ortsangabe Sinear als Ziel des Efa führt zu einer Unterscheidung Sinears von בבל (Sach 6,10), בת בבל, d.h. Tochter Babel (Sach 2,11) und ארץ צפון, dem Land des Nordens (Sach 2,10; 6,6.8). בבל und בת בבל werden allein in den Epexegesen der Nachtgesichte genannt. Babel ist Aufenthaltsort der Gola, die nach Sach 2,10-17 aufgerufen wird, von dort zu fliehen. Und aus Babel kommen diejenigen, die Gold und Silber für die Krone Josuas mitbringen. Das Land des Nordens ist ebenfalls im Aufruf an die Gola genannt (Sach 2,10), allerdings auch im letzten Nachtgesicht. Hier wird davon berichtet, daß der Geist Gottes ins Land des Nordens geht. Kann das erste Nachtgesicht von einer befriedeten Welt berichten, die Voraussetzung für den Neubeginn in Israel ist, so zentriert die Vision von Wagen und Pferden schließlich das Ausgehen des Geistes auf das Land des Nordens. Es ist hervorzuheben, daß in dieser Vision, anders als in den Epexegesen gerade nicht ausschließlich die Gola angesprochen ist<sup>(44)</sup>. Die Welt ruht, so daß der Geist Gottes auch in ehemaliges Feindesland ziehen und dort weilen kann. Es zeigt sich ein Gefälle von den Visionen hin zu den Epexegesen. Während die Perspektive auf die Nachbarn Israels in den Visionen nicht grundsätzlich von Feindschaft geprägt ist<sup>(45)</sup>, zeigen die Epexegesen ein anderes Bild. Dabei ist nicht nur die Vergangenheit, sind Zerstörung und Leid, die Babel Israel zugefügt hat, von Bedeutung, sondern auch die Gegenwart. Die zögerliche Rückkehr Israels aus dem Land des Nordens wird mit wachsendem Abstand zum Exil als Zurückhalten Israels verstanden. Sach 2,10-17 kann zwar an die Hörnervision, die durchaus kriegerische Töne bietet, anknüpfen. Sie

<sup>(44)</sup> Vgl. auch JEREMIAS, *Nachtgesichte*, 27; Anders ELLIGER, *Die Propheten*, 113.

<sup>(45)</sup> Zur Ruhe des ersten Nachtgesichts als schädlichem *status quo*, der Veränderung verhindert s. J. BLENKINSOPP, *Geschichte der Prophetie in Israel* (Stuttgart u.a. 1998), 208. שקט bezeichnet jedoch oft die Befreiung von Krieg, Bedrückung und Vernichtung (vgl. auch JEREMIAS, *Nachtgesichte*, 30).

ist jedoch nicht allein an Babel ausgerichtet, sondern stellt eine allgemeine Warnung gegen die Völker dar, Juda nie wieder Gewalt anzutun<sup>(46)</sup>. Für das Nachtgesicht vom Efa heißt dies, daß die in den Visionen hergestellten Bezüge zu Babylon und zum Land des Nordens keinen Anlaß dazu geben, Sinear mit Babylon gleichzusetzen.

Das Nachtgesicht von den Wagen und Pferden weist verschiedene Besonderheiten auf, die man häufig durch umfangreiche Eingriffe in den Text zu lösen versuchte. Dazu gehört auch, daß vier Wagen mit Pferden genannt werden, aber nur drei Farben für die Pferde, die ausziehen. Das rote fehlt. Bei den erwähnten Himmelsrichtungen handelt es sich um Nord und Süd. Der Westen ist bestenfalls angedeutet<sup>(47)</sup>. Der Osten nicht genannt. Nun ist dieses Nachtgesicht sicherlich vor der Efavision in den Zyklus aufgenommen worden. Dennoch läßt eines aufmerken: Sinear liegt im Osten (Gen 11,2) und der Osten wird von den Pferden ausgespart. Wenn sich diese Leserichtung für die Wagen- und Pferdevision also auch erst nach der Zusammenstellung der Nachtgesichte zu einem Siebenerzyklus ergibt, so mag man dies dennoch als einen weiteren Hinweis dafür verstehen, daß Sinear und Babylon, das Land des Nordens, zunächst einmal zu unterscheiden sind.

Daß Babel schließlich doch zum Synonym für Widergöttlichkeit und Boshaftigkeit wurde, ist auch in Gen 11,9 angelegt. Das siebte Nachtgesicht Sacharjas hat viel dazu beigetragen. Personifikation von Stadt, d.h. die Vorstellung von einer Stadt als Frau, wie sie u.a. in Jes 47 mit Bezug auf Babel genutzt wird<sup>(48)</sup>, und die Personifikation der Unrechtmäßigkeit als Frau in Sach 5,5-11 werden zusammengeführt zu einer Vorstellung von Babylon, die in der Hure Babel der Johannesapokalypse ihren Höhepunkt erreicht<sup>(49)</sup>.

Daß die Deutung auf Babylon als Land der Unrechtmäßigkeit jedoch nicht zwingend ist, zeigt schließlich die eng mit Sach 1-8

<sup>(46)</sup> Die Hörnervision ist Teil der Neuordnung der Welt, einschließlich Babylons, als Garantie für den Wiederaufbau Jerusalems (vgl. auch JEREMIAS, *Nachtgesichte*, 23).

<sup>(47)</sup> Im MT heißt es: "und die weißen folgten ihnen nach"; W. Rudolph bezieht "nach hinter sich" auf den Westen (*Haggai*, 123). S.a. SEYBOLD, *Bilder*, 29. Nimmt man an, daß aber nur zwei Himmelrichtungen genannt werden, so ergibt sich folgende Reihung im Hinblick auf die Zählung: Es gibt vier Wagen (vv. 2-3.), drei Pferdefarben (v. 6), zwei Himmelsrichtungen (v. 6) und schließlich einmal den Norden (v. 8), auf den alles in diesem Nachtgesicht zuläuft.

<sup>(48)</sup> Vgl. auch Jer 50 und 51 (בבל בל in 50,42 und 51,33); sowie Ps 137,8.

<sup>(49)</sup> Vgl. dazu auch KRATZ, "Serubbabel und Joschua", 34-35.

verwobene Grundschrift des Maleachibuches, genauer gesagt, Mal 1,4. Dieser Vers steht im Rahmen eines Gerichtswortes gegen Edom. Über Edom wird ein endgültiges Urteil gesprochen. Alle seine Mühen für einen Wiederaufbau, wie Israel ihn erfährt, werden umsonst sein. Gott wird alles niederreißen. Und man wird es "Land der Unrechtmäßigkeit" (גְּבוּל רָשָׁעָה) nennen. Noch einmal taucht der Terminus רָשָׁעָה auf. Jetzt handelt es sich nicht um Sinear, auch nicht um Babylon, sondern um Edom. Der Bruder, der mit den Feinden Israels gemeinsame Sache gemacht hat<sup>(50)</sup>, wird zerstört, wird zum Land der Schuld und Unrechtmäßigkeit, wo Leben in Gottes Gegenwart ausgeschlossen ist. Was nach Sach 5,5-11 noch den Hörerinnen und Hörern oder Leserinnen und Lesern des Nachtgesichts überlassen bleibt, nämlich die Verknüpfung Sinears mit einem konkreten Ort der Gegenwart, wird in Mal 1,4 vollzogen. In Ps 137 sind Babylon und Edom als das Paar gezeichnet, das der göttlichen Strafe für sein Handeln an Israel nicht entgehen kann.

\*  
\* \*

"Die Unrechtmäßigkeit wird an ihren Ort verwiesen". Auf der Ebene der Grundschrift des siebten Nachtgesichts Sacharjas, der Vision vom Efa, heißt dies, daß im Lande Ordnung hergestellt wird. Die von dem Mißbrauch von Maßen ausgehende Unrechtmäßigkeit wird in Gestalt des Efa entfernt und an den Ort gebracht, der synonym mit menschlicher Überheblichkeit ist, die Gottes Recht und Gerechtigkeit mißachtet. Mit der Aufnahme der Frau wird auch die Perspektive umfassender Schuld des Volkes in die Vision eingetragen. Sie gilt es zu tilgen, wenn ein Neuanfang in Israel möglich sein soll. Der Unrechtmäßigkeit aber wird in Sinear ein Tempel gebaut. Sie erfährt die Behandlung eines Götzen, der nun in die Bedeutungslosigkeit fällt. Ziel des Geschehens ist die Neuordnung des Landes. Aus dieser Perspektive heraus werden Schuld (עוֹן) und Unrechtmäßigkeit (רָשָׁעָה) nach Sinear gebracht.

Es geht weder um die Bestrafung Babylons noch um einen Austausch von Gott und Göttin. Der Vorgang ist einmalig und einzigartig. Die radikale Konsequenz, mit der die Schuld aus Israel entfernt wird, findet sich an keiner anderen Stelle im Alten Testament. Man muß sogar soweit gehen festzustellen, daß sich hierin erste

<sup>(50)</sup> Vgl. Ez 35; Obd 8-15; Ps 137,7. Vgl. auch ACHTEMEIER, *Nahum-Maleachi*, 176-177.

protoapokalyptische Elemente zeigen, die auf ein Urzeit-Endzeit-Schema zulaufen. Wenn auch noch nicht ausgereift, so vermittelt der Text doch, daß das aus der Urgeschichte der Menschheit stammende Böse zwar bedrohliches Potential hat, das Heil jedoch nicht mehr aufhalten kann.

Mühlenweg 64b  
31515 Wunstorf  
Deutschland

Corinna KÖRTING

#### SUMMARY

The article discusses two issues related to the seventh vision of Zechariah. First, it deals with the question of how a secondary revision of the text — or, more precisely, the introduction of the women — changes the entire perspective of the vision. Secondly, this new perspective is looked upon in its cultic aspects and in its relation to the eight visions. Viewed this way the vision presents a kind of fundamental liberation of the land and of its inhabitants, without any comparison in the Old Testament, inasmuch as guilt and wickedness will be taken back to their place of origin.



## Il “discorso del pazzo” o periautologia immoderata? Analisi retorico-letteraria di 2 Cor 11,1-12,18

Non si può negare che la 2 Corinzi canonica rappresenta una delle lettere paoline attraversate dal più denso spessore retorico: lo avevano già intuito Giovanni Crisostomo con le sue XXX Omelie dedicate alla lettera<sup>(1)</sup>, per l'Oriente, e Agostino d'Ippona con il suo *De Doctrina Christiana*, per l'Occidente<sup>(2)</sup>. Una delle sezioni della lettera maggiormente analizzate dall'esegesi contemporanea, è quella di 2 Cor 10-13 con una duplice prospettiva fondamentale: da una parte quella di chi mediante l'analisi retorica cerca di dimostrare l'integrità della lettera<sup>(3)</sup>, dall'altra di chi si propone di confermare uno degli apporti dell'analisi storico-critica, vale a dire che in realtà la sezione rappresenti parte di una lettera a se stante. In quest'ultimo caso, mentre alcuni commentatori pensano alla “lettera delle lacrime” di cui si accenna in 2 Cor 2,4, precedente a quella della riconciliazione di 2 Cor 1-9<sup>(4)</sup>, altri ipotizzano una successiva “lettera polemica”<sup>(5)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> Giovanni Crisostomo, *In secundam ad Corinthios epistulam commentarius* (PG 61, 381-610).

<sup>(2)</sup> Cf. l'ottima edizione critica con testo latino a fronte di Agostino d'Ippona, *La dottrina cristiana* (tr. V. TARULLI) (NBA VIII, Roma 1992).

<sup>(3)</sup> J.D.H. AMADOR, “Revisiting 2 Corinthians: Rhetoric and the Case for Unity”, *NTS* 46 (2000) 92-111; F.W. DANKER, “Paul's Debt to the *De Corona* of Demosthenes: A Study of Rhetorical Technique in Second Corinthians”, *Persuasive Artistry. Studies in New Testament, Festschrift G.A. Kennedy* (ed. D.F. WATSON) (JSNT SS 50, Sheffield 1991) 262-280; D.A. HESTER, “The Unity of 2 Corinthians: A Test Case for a Re-Discovered and Re-Invented Rhetoric”, *Neot* 33 (1999) 411-432; F.J. LONG, *Ancient Rhetoric and Paul's Apology. The Compositional Unity of 2 Corinthians* (SNTS MS 131; Cambridge 2004); U. SCHMIDT, »Nicht vergeblich empfangen«! Eine Untersuchung zum 2. Korintherbrief als Beitrag zur Frage nach der paulinischen Einschätzung des Handelns (Stuttgart 2004); J.H. THOMPSON, “Paul's Argument from Pathos in 2 Corinthians”, *Paul and Pathos* (eds. T.H. OLBRIGHT – J.L. SUMNEY) (SBL SS 16; Atlanta 2001) 128-145.

<sup>(4)</sup> D. AEJMELEAUS, *Streit und Versöhnung. Das Problem der Zusammensetzung des 2. Korintherbrief* (SES 46; Helsinki 1987) 98-104; Id., *Schwachheit als Waffe. Die Argumentation des Paulus im Tränenbrief (2. Kor. 10-13)* (SES 78; Göttingen 2000) 11-46; D.D. WALKER, *Paul's Offer of Leniency (2 Cor 10:1). Populist Ideology and Rhetoric in a Pauline Letter Fragment* (WUNT 2.152; Tübingen 2002); L.L. WELBORN, *Politics and Rhetoric in the Corinthian Epistles* (Macon GE 1997) 84-94.

<sup>(5)</sup> D.A. DE SILVA, “Measuring Penultimate against Ultimate Reality: An In-

Con il presente contributo non intendiamo affrontare le questioni relative alla formazione della 2 Corinzi canonica, su cui ci siamo soffermati nel commentario alla lettera<sup>(6)</sup>, ma concentrare la nostra attenzione sulla sezione di 2 Cor 11,1–12,18. Dove inizia e dove si conclude l'ormai famoso “discorso del pazzo”? Qual è la posta in gioco principale della sezione? E come si relaziona alla seconda apologia di 2 Cor 10,1–13,13? In ultima istanza si può denominare come *die Narrenrede* un discorso nel quale manca del tutto il *Wortfeld* relativo a  $\mu\omega\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$  -  $\mu\omega\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$  o non sarebbe più opportuno definirlo in modo diverso, cercando di cogliere la principale prospettiva retorico-letteraria posta in atto da Paolo?

### 1. Delimitazione e disposizione del discorso dell'ᾄφρων

Gran parte degli studiosi ritiene che in 2 Cor 11–12 Paolo pronunci il suo “discorso del pazzo”<sup>(7)</sup>, anche se non si è concordi sulla delimitazione della sezione: quale ne è la delimitazione? Per alcuni il discorso è contenuto nella sezione di 2 Cor 11,1–12,10<sup>(8)</sup>, per altri in

---

vestigation of the Integrity and Argumentation of 2 Corinthians”, *JSNT* 52 (1993) 41-70; V.P. FURNISH, *II Corinthians* (AB 32A; New York 1984) 44-48; R.P. MARTIN, *2 Corinthians* (WBC 40; Waco TE 1986) xlvi; M. THRALL, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (ICC; Edinburgh 1994) 48.

<sup>(6)</sup> A. PITTA, *La seconda Lettera ai Corinzi* (Roma 2006) 17-31, con l'esito conclusivo a favore della “lettera polemica” in 2 Cor 10–13 e non per quello della “lettera delle lacrime”.

<sup>(7)</sup> Sull'ormai acquisita definizione “discorso del pazzo” per 2 Cor 11–12 cf. P. BARNETT, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids – Cambridge 1997) 494; C. BÖTTRICH, “2Kor 11,1 als Programmwort der »Narrenrede«”, *ZNW* 88 (1997) 135-139; R. BULTMANN, *Der zweite Brief an die Korinther* (KEK; Göttingen 1976) 201; FURNISH, *II Corinthians*, 485; M.J. HARRIS, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians. A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids 2005) 733; U. HECKEL, *Kraft in Schwachheit*. Untersuchungen zu 2 Kor 10–13 (WUNT 2.56; Tübingen 1993) 22-23; J. LAMBRECHT, “The Fool's Speech and Its Context: Paul's Particular Way of Arguing in 2 Cor 10–13”, *Bib* 82 (2001) 305-324; MARTIN, *2 Corinthians*, 332; G. STRECKER, “Die Legitimität des paulinischen Apostolates nach 2 Kor 10–13”, *Verteidigung und Begründung des apostolischen Amtes (2 Kor 10–13)* (Hrsg. E. LOHSE) (MRB 11; Roma 1992) 110-111; THRALL, *Second Corinthians*, 658; WALKER, *Paul's Offer of Leniency*, 300; B. WITHERINGTON III, *Conflict & Community in Corinth. A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids 1995) 442-444; J. ZMIJEWSKI, *Der Stil der paulinischen „Narrenrede“*. Analyse der Sprachgestaltung in 2 Kor 11,1–12,10 als Beitrag zur Methodik von Stiluntersuchungen neutestamentlicher Texte (BBB 52; Köln – Bonn 1978).

<sup>(8)</sup> ZMIJEWSKI, *Der Stil der paulinische „Narrenrede“*, 76.

2 Cor 11,1–12,13<sup>(9)</sup> oppure in 2 Cor 11,16–12,10<sup>(10)</sup>, in 2 Cor 11,16–12,18<sup>(11)</sup> e in 2 Cor 11,22–12,10<sup>(12)</sup>. Forse per risolvere la questione è opportuno distinguere la *probatio* retorica, con la quale Paolo espone le prove della propria apologia<sup>(13)</sup>, dal discorso vero e proprio, a prescindere dalla pertinenza della sua definizione.

Secondo i trattati della retorica antica, la *probatio* di una comunicazione apologetica o categorica dovrebbe essere collocata subito dopo l'esordio e prima della *refutatio* delle accuse mosse dagli avversari. Così Aristotele prescrive nel suo trattato: “Bisogna, sia nel discorso deliberativo sia in quello giudiziario, comunicare prima con l'esporre le proprie argomentazioni, in un secondo momento, invece, rispondere a quelle avversarie, confutandole e screditandole. Se invece l'opposizione è stata abbondante, bisogna prima confutare gli argomenti avversari...”<sup>(14)</sup>. Poiché sono diverse le accuse rivoltegli dagli avversari (cf. 2 Cor 10,2.10), in 2 Cor 10–13 Paolo preferisce far precedere l'elenco delle prove dalla confutazione apologetica (2 Cor 10,7–18)<sup>(15)</sup>; ne risulta la seguente disposizione retorico-letteraria:

<sup>(9)</sup> BARNETT, *Second Corinthians*, 494–495; HARRIS, *Second Corinthians*, 729–730; HECKEL, *Kraft in Schwachheit*, 22 che distingue il discorso del pazzo in termini lati (2 Cor 11,1–12,13) da quello propriamente tale (cf. 2 Cor 11,21b–12,10); G. HOTZE, *Paradoxien bei Paulus*. Untersuchungen zu einer elementaren Denkform in seiner Theologie (NF 33; Münster 1997) 167–168; K.-W. NIEBUHR, *Heidenapostel aus Israel*. Die jüdische Identität des Paulus nach ihre Darstellung in seinen Briefen (WUNT 62; Tübingen 1992) 112–113.

<sup>(10)</sup> MARTIN, *2 Corinthians*, 357–362.

<sup>(11)</sup> H.G. SUNDERMANN, *Der schwache Apostel und die Kraft der Rede*. Eine rhetorische Analyse von 2 Kor 10–13 (EH XIII 575; Frankfurt a. M. 1996) 45.

<sup>(12)</sup> LAMBRECHT, “The Fool’s Speech”, 306; Id., *Second Corinthians* (Sacra Pagina 8; Collegeville 1999) 195; G. SEGALLA, “Struttura letteraria e unità della 2 Corinzi”, *Teologia* 13 (1988) 208–209.

<sup>(13)</sup> Su 2 Cor 11,1–12,18 come *probatio* retorica cf. PETERSON, *Eloquence and the Proclamation of the Gospel in Corinth* (SBL DS 163; Atlanta 1998), 104–139.

<sup>(14)</sup> *Rhetorica* 3,17,1418b. Sulla *confutatio*, nota anche come *reprehensio*, *refutatio*, cf. inoltre Cicerone, *De inventione*, 1,42,78–96; Cornificio, *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 1,10,18; Quintiliano, *Institutio Oratoria* 5,13,1–60. Per una trattazione della *confutatio* nei trattati della retorica antica cf. J. MARTIN, *Antike Rhetorik*. Technik und Methode (München 1974) 124–137.

<sup>(15)</sup> Già H.-D. WENDLAND, *Le lettere ai Corinzi* (NT 7; Brescia 1976) 415 definiva, prima che si sviluppasse la metodologia del *rhetorical criticism* all'epistolario paolino, la sezione di 2 Cor 10,1–18 come “confutazione delle accuse e dell'arroganza degli avversari”. Da parte nostra, preferiamo distinguere l'esordio generale di 2 Cor 10,1–6 dalla confutazione vera e propria di 2 Cor 10,7–18.

- 1) Esordio generale della seconda apologia (2 Cor 10,1-6);
- 2) la confutazione delle accuse (2 Cor 10,7-18)
- 3) la *probatio* (2 Cor 11,1-12,18)
- 4) *postscriptum* epistolare (2 Cor 12,19-13,13)<sup>(16)</sup>.

A sua volta la *probatio* apologetica non comincia *ex abrupto* bensì con un esordio (cf. 2 Cor 11,1-6) specifico con il quale, facendo ricorso soprattutto alla figura retorica della *prodiortosi* — consistente nell'avanzare alcune precauzioni per non essere frainteso dai destinatari<sup>(17)</sup> — Paolo introduce il cosiddetto discorso dell'ἄφρων<sup>(18)</sup>. Lo stesso motivo della sopportazione, citato nei vv. 1.4, segnala la natura introduttiva dei vv. 1-6; ed è confermata dall'esordio del *De Corona* 10 di Demostene: “Se sapete che io sono proprio come lui mi accusava di essere... non dovete sopportare (ἀνάσχεισθε) nemmeno la mia voce”<sup>(19)</sup>.

Come *terminus ad quem* della *probatio* apologetica riteniamo che con la sezione di 2 Cor 12,19-13,13 subentri il *postscriptum* della lettera, caratterizzato dalla presenza dei motivi tipicamente epistolari della apusia-parusia (cf. 2 Cor 12,20-21; 13,1-2)<sup>(20)</sup>, dell'appello fi-

<sup>(16)</sup> Per una trattazione dettagliata cf. PITTA, *Seconda Corinzi*, 387-390.

<sup>(17)</sup> La *prodiortosi* di 2 Cor 11,1 era già stata identificata da Giovanni Crisostomo, *In secundam ad Corinthios* 23,1: “Prima di cominciare a fare i propri elogi, si è servito di una grande precauzione (προδιόρθωσις)”. Anche quella di 2 Cor 11,6 è una *prodiortosi* retorica, a dimostrazione dell'unità retorica di 2 Cor 11,1-6.

<sup>(18)</sup> Alcuni studiosi, come G. BARBAGLIO, *La teologia di Paolo*. Abbozzi in forma epistolare (Bologna 1999) 294; BARNETT, *Second Corinthians*, 496; LAMBRECHT, *Second Corinthians*, 180; e F. MANZI, “Il vanto della coscienza apostolica di Paolo. La struttura letteraria e il messaggio della Seconda Lettera ai Corinzi”, *ScCatt* 130 (2002) 722, delimitano il paragrafo ai vv. 1-4 a causa dell'inclusione causata dalla ripresa del verbo ἀνέχομαι nei vv. 1.4. Riteniamo che la motivazione sia debole, in quanto soltanto con il v. 7 subentri l'apostrofe, in forma di domanda, rivolta ai destinatari dell'apologia, anche se, come vedremo, i vv. 5-6 dell'esordio assumono una significativa autonomia nell'esordio paolino.

<sup>(19)</sup> Sulle relazioni tra l'apologia paolina di 2 Cor 10-13 e il *De Corona* di Demostene cf. F.W. DANKER, “Paul's Debt to the *De Corona* of Demosthenes: A Study of Rhetorical Technique in Second Corinthians”, *Persuasive Artistry*, FS. G.A. Kennedy (ed. D.F. WATSON) (JSNT SS 50; Sheffield 1991) 262-280.

<sup>(20)</sup> L'annuncio della terza visita di Paolo a Corinto in 2 Cor 12,14 ha indotto alcuni a considerare questo verso come inizio del paragrafo finale dell'apologia. Cf. BARNETT, *Second Corinthians*, 577; FURNISH, *II Corinthians*, 552-557; HARRIS, *Second Corinthians*, 869; MATERA, *II Corinthians*. A Commentary (Louisville 2003) 286-291; PETERSON, *Eloquence*, 128. In realtà quello di 2 Cor 12,14 rappresenta soltanto un accenno alla apusia-parusia epistolare, asserito in fun-

nale di carattere apologetico (cf. 2 Cor 12,19; 13,3-4), delle ultime raccomandazioni epistolari (cf. 2 Cor 13,5-10) e dei saluti finali (cf. 2 Cor 13,11-13). Non a caso, in 2 Cor 12,19 Paolo richiama, in modo esplicito, il genere retorico della propria difesa, per introdurre la sezione conclusiva della lettera: Πάσαι δοκεῖτε ὅτι ὑμῖν ἀπολογούμεθα; κατέναντι θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ λαλοῦμεν.

Pertanto ci sembra che, mentre la *probatio* apologetica sia rappresentata dalla sezione di 2 Cor 11,1-12,18, il discorso dell’ἄφρων vero e proprio sia contenuto in quella di 2 Cor 11,7-12,10. Inoltre si può notare che le sentenze di 2 Cor 11,5-6 presentano le caratteristiche proprie di una tesi retorica: sia di quelle raccomandate dalla retorica antica, sia quelle che si riscontrano nelle *propositiones* analoghe dell’epistolario paolino (cf. le tesi principali di Gal 1,11-12 e di Rm 1,16-17 per citare quelle più condivise dalla critica contemporanea)<sup>(21)</sup>. Seguendo le annotazioni di Cicerone, la proposizione di 2 Cor 11,5-6 è “breve, completa e concisa”<sup>(22)</sup>.

A sua volta, J.-N. Aletti ha ben evidenziato che raramente le *propositiones* paoline sono delle vere e proprie *partitiones*, ossia non introducono in dettaglio le parti successive delle sue dimostrazioni (ad eccezione di Col 1,21-23) bensì sono di natura generale<sup>(23)</sup>. Piuttosto queste segnalano un cambiamento stilistico rispetto al contesto di appartenenza, assumono una funzione prolettica più che analettica; ed assolvono al compito di generare le successive micro e macro-unità letterarie<sup>(24)</sup>. Per questo i vv. 5-6, introdotti dalla formula λογίζομαι γὰρ..., pur appartenendo alla stessa micro-unità letteraria di 2 Cor

---

zione del fatto che Paolo non intenderà neanche in futuro essere di peso ai Corinzi. Sulla micro-unità di 2 Cor 12,11-18 cf. MARTIN, *2 Corinthians*, 426; THRALL, *Second Corinthians*, 832; e sulla sua natura perorante rispetto alle prove precedenti cf. SUNDERMANN, *Der schwache Apostel*, 182-183.

<sup>(21)</sup> Si deve a J.-N. Aletti l’importanza da conferire alle *propositiones* principali e secondarie per cogliere lo snodarsi delle dimostrazioni paoline. Cf. J.-N. ALETTI, “La présence d’un modèle rhétorique en Romains: Son rôle et son importance”, *Bib* 71 (1990) 1-24; Id., “La dispositio rhétorique dans les épîtres pauliniennes. Propositions de méthode”, *NTS* 38 (1992) 385-401; Id., “Paul et la Rhétorique. État de la question et propositions”, *Paul de Tarse. Congrès de l’ACFEB (Strasbourg 1995)* (ed. J. SCHLOSSER) (LD 165; Paris 1996) 27-50.

<sup>(22)</sup> Cicerone, *De Inventione* 1,22,32: “Quae partitio rerum distributam continet expositionem, haec habere debet: brevitatem, absolutionem, paucitatem”.

<sup>(23)</sup> ALETTI, “La dispositio”, 397.

<sup>(24)</sup> ALETTI, “La présence d’un modèle”, 10; Id., *La lettera ai Romani e la giustizia di Dio* (Roma 1997) 29-31.

1,1-6, presentano i tratti di una sentenza autonoma che Paolo intende dimostrare nel corso delle dimostrazioni successive. In pratica in 2 Cor 11,1-12,18 egli decide finalmente di confrontarsi con i “superapostoli”, intessendo una σύγκρισις o un confronto con i suoi avversari<sup>(25)</sup>: un confronto prima negato in 2 Cor 10,12-17 e poi sostenuto, con forza, in 2 Cor 11,1-12,18, giacché egli si vede costretto a doverlo pronunciare a causa del mancato sostegno dei Corinzi di fronte alle accuse dei suoi avversari (cf. 2 Cor 12,11).

Dal versante contenutistico, la *propositio* verte su un confronto incentrato sull’inferiorità o sulla superiorità non tanto della “parola” o dell’eloquio puramente verboso, quanto sulla “conoscenza” (di Cristo) e sul modo di relazionarsi con i Corinzi: questioni che tratterà secondo un ordine inverso o mediante una *reversio* retorica<sup>(26)</sup> nei tre paragrafi dimostrativi di 2 Cor 11,7-12,10. In modo schematico richiamiamo le relazioni tra la *propositio* e la *probatio* paolina:

- (a) Incolto nell’eloquenza ma non nella conoscenza (v. 6a);
- (b) in tutto è stato manifesto verso i Corinzi (v. 6b);
- (b’) gratuità nel ministero a Corinto (2 Cor 11,7-21a);
- (a’) le credenziali e le avversità per Cristo (2 Cor 11,21b-33);
- (a’’) le visioni e le rivelazioni di Cristo (2 Cor 12,1-10).

Forse è bene precisare che mentre in una composizione chiasmica del tipo a-b-b’-a’ sono tutti i termini delle parti a dover essere evidenziati, altrimenti si rischia di produrne una artificiale (fenomeno frequente nell’esegesi paolina), in una *reversio* si assiste ad una ripresa concettuale inversa di quanto è sostenuto in a-b. Inoltre nel nostro caso si assiste allo sviluppo in due parti del confronto sulla “conoscenza” che, di fatto, corrisponde a quella di Cristo<sup>(27)</sup>: in a’ (2 Cor 11,21b-33) domina il confronto sul ministero per Cristo, attraverso il lungo elenco delle avversità (vv. 23-27); e in a’’ (2 Cor 12,1-10) subentra la narrazione “delle visioni e delle rivelazioni del Signore”.

<sup>(25)</sup> Si noti l’uso dei verbi tipici συγκρίνω e συγκρίνοντες utilizzati in 2 Cor 10,12.

<sup>(26)</sup> Sulla *reversio* come figura di pensiero che si differenzia dal chiasmo, figura di parola o sintattica, cf. B. MORTARA GARAVELLI, *Manuale di retorica* (Milano 1988) 247. Il ricorso di Paolo alla *reversio* retorica è posto in risalto dal recente commentario alla lettera ai Filippesi di J.-N. ALETTI, *Saint Paul épître aux Philippiens*. Introduction, traduction et commentaire (ÉB NS 55; Paris 2005) 67, a proposito di Fil 1,12-26.

<sup>(27)</sup> Anche nella periautologia di Fil 3,2-16 la *magna pars* è occupata dalla conoscenza di Cristo, intesa non come percorso misterico o gnostico bensì come dono soprannaturale di Dio: retroterra ben evidenziato da ALETTI, *Philippiens*, 248.

Una volta concluso il discorso dell’ἄφρων (cf. 2 Cor 12,10), Paolo riprende gli elementi principali della *propositio* per intessere l’appello o la *peroratio* finale rivolta ai destinatari:

2 Cor 11,5-6	2 Cor 12,11
(v. 5) μηδὲν ὕστερηκέναι τῶν ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων.	οὐδὲν γὰρ ὕστέρησα τῶν ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων
(v. 6) εἰ δὲ καὶ ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ, ἀλλ’ οὐ τῇ γνώσει, ἀλλ’ ἐν παντὶ φανερῶσαντες ἐν πᾶσιν εἰς ὑμᾶς.	εἰ καὶ οὐδὲν εἰμι.

Dalle osservazioni rilevate emerge la seguente disposizione retorico-letteraria della sezione:

- 1) *Exordium* (11,1-6) con la *propositio* principale (vv. 5-6);
- 2) *probatio* (11,7-12,10):
  - a) la gratuità nell’evangelizzazione (11,7-21a);
  - b) le credenziali e il catalogo delle avversità (11,21b-33);
  - c) le visioni e le rivelazioni (12,1-10);
- 3) *peroratio* (12,11-18).

Pertanto riteniamo che il discorso dell’ἄφρων sia preceduto dall’esordio specifico di 2 Cor 11,1-6, con la tesi principale di 2 Cor 11,5-6, e sia seguito dalla perorazione di 2 Cor 12,11-18. La disposizione del discorso dovrebbe offrire le motivazioni per cui Paolo si finge tutt’altro che pazzo per essere accettato dai suoi interlocutori.

## 2. La parola della croce e il discorso dell’ἄφρων

Una delle prime, anche se non principali motivazioni per cui riteniamo che quello di 2 Cor 11,1-12,18 non rappresenti affatto “il discorso del pazzo”, è rappresentata dalla carenza totale del linguaggio tipico del μωρός che Paolo ben conosce ed utilizza soprattutto per la “parola della croce” in 1 Cor 1,18-4,21<sup>(28)</sup> poiché “è piaciuto a Dio salvare i credenti con la follia della predicazione” (cf. 1 Cor 1,21), Paolo esorta gli stessi destinatari a “diventare folli per considerarsi sapienti in questo mondo” (cf. 1 Cor 3,18).

Nel suo contributo su *Paul, the Fool of Christ*, L.L. Welborn ha ben dimostrato che nella sezione di 1 Cor 1,18-4,21 Paolo ricorre ad

<sup>(28)</sup> Cf. l’uso di μωρός in 1 Cor 1,25.27; 3,18; anche 2 Tm 2,23; 3,9; e per il resto del NT cf. Mt 5,22; 7,26; 23,17; 25,2.3.8; del sostantivo μωρία in 1 Cor 1,18.21.23; 2,14; 3,19 (solo in questa sezione per tutto il NT); e di μωραίνω in 1 Cor 1,20; Rm 1,20; anche Mt 5,13; Lc 14,34. Cf. infine l’hapax legomenon μωρολογία in Ef 5,4.



uno dei caratteri diffusi nella tragedia greca e nella commedia romana<sup>(29)</sup>: quello del pazzo che pronuncia un discorso soltanto in apparenza sconclusionato ma che alla fine risulta capace di comunicare verità indiscusse. Il mimo del pazzo è così evocato da Orazio: “La ruvidezza zotica, sgraziata e fastidiosa, che si affida a testa rasata e denti neri, attribuendosi patente di libertà assoluta e virtù vera... L’altro invece disputa e spesso, su fondamenti di lana caprina. Si batte armato di sciocchezze”<sup>(30)</sup>. Il mimo del folle è ripreso anche da Apuleio, nelle sue *Metamorphoseon*, a proposito di un certo Socrate<sup>(31)</sup>; e nella storiografia latina è diffusa la pazzia attribuita all’Imperatore Claudio, come ben ricorda Svetonio: “(Nerone) insultò Claudio morto con ogni genere di oltraggio, facendone notare ora la stupidaggine e ora la crudeltà. Faceva anche un gioco di parole, allungando la prima sillaba della parola latina *morari*, in modo che egli aveva cessato di vivere tra gli uomini, si intendesse che aveva cessato di fare il pazzo” (*Nero* 33,1)<sup>(32)</sup>. Infine in uno dei papiri greci antichi si racconta del caso di una certa Caritione, difesa da un folle davanti al re che stava per sacrificarla alla dea Selene (cf. *P.Oxy* 413, databile nel II sec. d.C.)<sup>(33)</sup>.

Il mimo del pazzo si adatta bene al discorso di 1 Cor 1–4 giacché è in questione la follia della croce, quale via scelta da Dio per confondere sia i giudei sia i greci: e soltanto con il ricorso alla pazzia potranno essere accolte dalla comunità di Corinto le implicazioni ecclesiali della predicazione paolina.

<sup>(29)</sup> L.L. WELBORN, *Paul the Fool of Christ: A Study of 1 Corinthians 1-4 in the Comic-Philosophic Tradition* (JSNT SS 293; London - New York 2005) 22-33.

<sup>(30)</sup> ORAZIO, *Epistulae* 1,18,10-14.

<sup>(31)</sup> Cf. APULEIO, *Metamorphoseon* 1,6-7; cf. anche il caso riportato in *Metamorphoseon* 10,2-12. Il caso di Socrate è scelto da WELBORN, *Paul, the Fool of Christ*, 34-36 per porre in risalto le caratteristiche del mimo sulla follia.

<sup>(32)</sup> Cf. inoltre SVETONIO, *Claudius* 15,4: “Nei processi e nei giudizi fu estremamente variabile: ora sagace e circospetto, ora inconsulto e precipitoso, ora frivolo e quasi folle (*amentique*); 38,3 “Conscio di essere soggetto all’ira e al risentimento, se ne scusò con un editto, facendo distinzione tra i due sentimenti e promettendo che la prima sarebbe stata di breve durata e di nessuna conseguenza, e il secondo non sarebbe mai stato ingiusto”; 40,1: “Spesso, poi dimostrava una tale sbadataggine nelle parole e negli atti che sembrava non si rendesse conto né di chi fosse né chi fossero gli ascoltatori né del luogo o del tempo in cui stava parlando”.

<sup>(33)</sup> ANONYMOUS, *Charition, Select papyri III. Literary Papyri. Poetry* (ed. D.L. PAGE) (LCL 360; Cambridge – London 1992) 336-349. L’episodio è analizzato in dettaglio da WELBORN, *Paul, the Fool of Christ*, 41-43.

Con il discorso 2 Cor 11,1–12,18 non soltanto scompare del tutto il linguaggio del μωρός ma, dato ancora più rilevante, non si accenna mai alla centralità della staurologia paolina, da riprendere semmai nel nuovo contesto della “lettera polemica”. Soltanto nel *potscriptum* di 2 Cor 12,19–13,13 si accenna all’evento della croce: καὶ γὰρ ἐσταυρώθη ἐξ ἀσθενείας, ἀλλὰ ζῇ ἐκ δυνάμεως θεοῦ. καὶ γὰρ ἡμεῖς ἀσθενούμεν ἐν αὐτῷ (2 Cor 13,4). E si può notare come l’evento della croce di Cristo non è più presentato da Paolo secondo il paradigma paradossale della “follia e della sapienza” di 1 Cor 1–4, poiché è ritenuto come già acquisito dai destinatari, bensì per porre in risalto il passaggio dalla debolezza alla vita di Cristo per la potenza di Dio: il prospetto fondamentale che domina in 2 Cor 11,1–12,18 mediante il nuovo paradosso della potenza di Cristo che si realizza nella debolezza di Paolo, riprendendo l’oracolo cristologico di 2 Cor 12,9. Pertanto ci sembra che quanto al genere retorico, in 2 Cor 11,1–12,18 Paolo non si finga affatto pazzo, come invece in 1 Cor 1–4, per essere ben accolto dai destinatari, ma che la sua ὀφροσύνη (cf. 2 Cor 11,1) sia modulata su un altro registro, che permette di rileggere in modo diverso il discorso dell’ἄφρων.

### 3. La questione del metro

L’interrogativo sulla definizione del discorso di 2 Cor 11–12 non è semplicemente né soltanto di tipo semantico bensì riguarda il senso e la portata del confronto tra Paolo e i suoi avversari. Di fatto, in quanto tali il sostantivo ὀφροσύνη e i termini collegati, possono essere tradotti con follia o con pazzia. Piuttosto la questione principale verte sulla posta in gioco della “lettera polemica” (2 Cor 10–13). In pratica se la sezione di 2 Cor 11,1–12,18 è riletta secondo il paradigma della follia non presenta consistenti relazioni con la sezione precedente di 2 Cor 10,1–18 e può essere considerata come separata dalla lettera polemica, mentre riteniamo, come abbiamo proposto nella breve *dispositio* della lettera, che rappresenti la *pars construens* rispetto a quella *destruens* precedente.

Si può ben rilevare che nella *refutatio* apologetica di 2 Cor 10,7–18 Paolo non accusi gli avversari di follia o di pazzia, bensì di una insensatezza (cf. οὐ συνιᾶσιν di 2 Cor 10,12) che deriva dalla mancanza del μέτρον τοῦ κανόνος conferito dal Signore per ognuno (cf. 2 Cor 10,13). L’uso del vocabolario tipico della periautologia o del vanto di sé (cf. 2 Cor 10,8) e del confronto fra persone in 2 Cor 10,12 (Οὐ γὰρ τολμῶμεν ἐγκρίναι ἢ συγκρίναι ἑαυτοὺς τισιν τῶν ἑαυτοὺς

συνιστανόντων), dimostra che, da una parte, è in questione un vanto puramente umano contro uno secondo il Signore (cf. 2 Cor 10,17-18) e, dall'altra, se Paolo debba accettare la sfida degli avversari mediante una σύγκρισις o un confronto sulle credenziali dell'apostolato.

Forse è bene ricordare che in qualsiasi forma di periautologia è altissimo il rischio di risultare immoderati. Per questo Plutarco redigerà un manuale su *Come vantarsi senza suscitare l'invidia* negli ascoltatori<sup>(34)</sup>. Con decisione Menandro aveva raccomandato al suo ideale interlocutore: "Non tessere l'elogio su te stesso" (*Sentenze* 778)<sup>(35)</sup>. E se costretti dalle situazioni, come nel caso di Demostene, vale la sua *prodiortosi*, pronunciata nell'*exordium* del suo *De Corona* 4, che rappresenta un significativo precedente rispetto a quella intessuta da Paolo in 2 Cor 11,1: "Ascoltiamo volentieri le ingiurie e le accuse, ci secchiamo invece con chi elogia se stesso".

La prospettiva periautologica di Paolo in 2 Cor 10-13 era stata già intuita da Giovanni Crisostomo che, a commento di 2 Cor 10,7, annotava: "Questo è ciò che più di tutto si può ammirare di Paolo, insieme ad altro: che, costretto per la grande necessità ad esaltare se stesso, entrambe realizza, questa e quella, per non sembrare odioso con questa *periautologia*"<sup>(36)</sup>. Pertanto, costretto dalla situazione apo-

<sup>(34)</sup> PLUTARCO, *De se ipsum citra invidiam laudando*, *Moralia* III (Porde-  
none 1992) 295-347. Cf. i commenti di H.D. BETZ, "De laude ipsius (*Moralia*  
539A-547F)", *Plutarch's Ethical Writings and Early Christian Literature*  
(SCHNT 4; Leiden 1978); M. VALLOZZA, "Osservazioni sulle tecniche argomen-  
tative del discorso di lode nel «De laude ipsius» di Plutarco", *Strutture formali*  
*dei «Moralia» di Plutarco*, Atti del III Convegno plutarco, Palermo 3-5 mag-  
gio 1989 (edd. G. D'IPPOLITO - I. GALLO) (Napoli 1991) 327-334.

<sup>(35)</sup> Sulla periautologia nel contesto greco-romano cf. anche l'*excursus* su  
"Come lodarsi senza essere malvisti" di Ermogene di Tarso, *ΠΕΡΙ ΜΕΤΟΔΟΥ*  
*ΔΕΙΝΟΘΗΤΩΝ* 25, *Hermogenis Opera* (ed. H. RABE) (Leipzig 1913) 441-442;  
SENECA, *Epistulae* 7,6-9; 11,9; 96,1-3; PLINIO IL GIOVANE, *Lettere ai familiari*  
1,8,4-5; Quintiliano, *Institutio Oratoria* 11,1,11-24. Sui paradigmi e le funzioni  
della periautologia antica cf. L. PERNOT, "Periautologia. Problèmes et méthode  
de l'éloge de soi-même en la tradition éthique et rhétorique gréco-romaine", *Re-  
vue des études grecques* 111 (1998) 101-124.

<sup>(36)</sup> *In secundam ad Corinthios* 22,1. Sulle relazioni tra il manuale plutar-  
cheo e il commento di Giovanni Crisostomo a 2 Cor 10-13 cf. l'ottimo contri-  
buto di M.M. MITCHELL, "A Patristic Perspective on Pauline *periautologia*",  
*NTS* 47 (2001) 354-371 che si sofferma anche sul *V panegirico* del Crisostomo a  
Paolo. Per l'edizione italiana dei panegirici cf. GIOVANNI CRISOSTOMO, *Panegi-  
rici su San Paolo* (ed. S. Zincone) (Roma 1995) 75-87. Sulla periautologia pao-  
lina in genere cf. C. FORBES, "Comparison, Self-Praise and Irony: Paul's

logetica, Paolo decide non soltanto d'intessere una pericolosa periautologia bensì di confrontarsi con gli avversari sul metro del canone, con l'inevitabile rischio di risultare immoderato più che folle, insensato<sup>(37)</sup> o stolto<sup>(38)</sup>.

#### 4. *Le immoderazioni del discorso*

Se in 2 Cor 11,1–12,18 è in gioco la moderazione e/o l'immoderazione, è necessario evidenziare i versanti del confronto e del vanto posti sul banco delle prove. Prima di delineare le prove principali addotte da Paolo ci sembra opportuno richiamare l'uso semantico dei termini che segnalano il binomio “superiorità-inferiorità” nel corso della lettera polemica, giacché la litote della *propositio* principale (2 Cor 11,5: “Ritengo di non essere in nulla inferiore ai superapostoli”) verte non tanto sulla parità tra Paolo e i super-apostoli (cf. 2 Cor 11,22) quanto sulla superiorità o sull'inferiorità del loro confronto (cf. 2 Cor 11,12.23)<sup>(39)</sup>.

Rispetto alla superiorità del confronto risalta in particolare l'uso del prefisso avverbiale ὑπέρ, di cui Paolo si serve, per deridere i “su-

---

Boasting and the Conventions of Hellenistic Rhetoric”, *NTS* 32 (1986) 1-30; sulla sua rilevanza in 1 Tessalonicesi e in Galati cf. G. LYONS, *Pauline Autobiography. Toward a New Understanding* (SBL DS 73; Atlanta 1985); A. PITTA, *Lettera ai Galati*. Introduzione, versione e commento (SOC 9; Bologna 2000) 85-90; in Filippesi 3,1–4,1 cf. ALETTI, *Philippiens*, 220-221; F. BIANCHINI, *L'elogio di sé in Cristo*. L'utilizzo della περιουτολογία nel contesto di Filippesi 3,1–4,1 (AnBib 164; Roma 2006) 143-145; A. PITTA, “Paolo e il giudaismo farisaico”, *Ricerche storico bibliche* 11 (1999) 91-92; in 2 Cor 10–13 cf. H.D. BETZ, *Der Apostel Paulus und die sokratische Tradition. Eine exegetische Untersuchung zu seiner “Apologie”*. 2 Korinther 10–13 (BHT 45; Tübingen 1972).

<sup>(37)</sup> F. MANZI, *Seconda Lettera ai Corinzi*. Nuova versione, introduzione e commento (LB 9; Milano 2002) 270.

<sup>(38)</sup> BARBAGLIO, *Teologia di Paolo*, 294; A. COLACRAI, *Forza dei deboli e debolezza dei potenti*. La coppia «debole:forte» nel *Corpus Paulinum* (Cinisello Balsamo 2003) 351-368.

<sup>(39)</sup> Alla luce delle successive dimostrazioni della *probatio* la litote di 2 Cor 11,5 può essere tradotta con “ritengo di essere in tutto superiore ai superapostoli”. Anche HARRIS, *Second Corinthians*, 747-748 riconosce la presenza della litote in 2 Cor 11,5 ma sostiene che si riferisca allo stato di uguaglianza tra Paolo e gli apostoli di Gerusalemme. In realtà la prosecuzione del discorso riguarda non tanto l'uguaglianza quanto la superiorità o l'inferiorità, nell'ottica del confronto sul metro del canone che abbiamo segnalato. Forse si deve all'errata identificazione dei superapostoli con gli apostoli di Gerusalemme, il diffuso fraintendimento sulla portata della litote paolina.

per-apostoli” (2 Cor 11,5)<sup>(40)</sup>. Sul versante opposto, ma in misura minore, si colloca il vocabolario dell’inferiorità<sup>(41)</sup>. I passi segnalati dimostrano come la contesa sulla superiorità e sull’inferiorità riguarda non soltanto il confronto con gli avversari ma coinvolge anche le relazioni tra Paolo e i Corinzi, come dimostra l’inizio delle prove apologetiche: ἐμαυτὸν ταπεινῶν ἵνα ὑμεῖς ὑψωθῆτε (2 Cor 11,7). Per questo il motivo dell’umiltà non è utilizzato in 2 Cor 10,1-13,13 secondo una prospettiva positiva, come ad esempio nel caso di Fil 2,1-11, bensì negativa, di chi teme di essere nuovamente umiliato, in base al paradigma dell’inferiorità, in occasione di una prossima visita nella capitale dell’Acaia (cf. 2 Cor 12,21).

Naturalmente nell’apologia paolina non mancano tratti di parità con i suoi avversari. Tuttavia è bene precisare che la parità è poco condivisa e che, all’inizio della *confutazione*, è formulata nella prospettiva di una *concessio* retorica (cf. 2 Cor 10,7) per essere smentita nella *probatio* dalla violenta vituperazione di 2 Cor 11,13-15, con cui pone in discussione proprio il loro apostolato. Lo stato di parità è infine presentato come dato di continuità in 2 Cor 11,22, ma soltanto per preparare la superiorità di Paolo nel ministero, altrimenti la σύγκρισις perderebbe di consistenza<sup>(42)</sup>.

#### a) Ὁ ἄφροσύνη nella gratuità (2 Cor 11,7-21a)

Il primo paragrafo del discorso immodesto si concentra sul ricordo dell’evangelizzazione gratuita di Paolo a Corinto, al punto che

<sup>(40)</sup> Al versante della superiorità appartengono anzitutto l’espressione τῶν ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων, (citata nuovamente in 2 Cor 12,11), il verbo ὑπερεκτείνωμεν (2 Cor 10,14), ἡ ὑπὲρ ἐγὼ di 2 Cor 11,23, l’avverbio ὑπερβαλλόντως (2 Cor 11,23), il sintagma λογίσηται ὑπέρ (2 Cor 12,6) e il sostantivo ὑπερβολή (2 Cor 12,7). Nello stesso orizzonte andrebbero collocati il sostantivo ὕψωμα (2 Cor 10,5) e il verbo ὑψωθῆτε (2 Cor 11,7), oltre al verbo ἐπαίρω (cf. 2 Cor 10,5; 11,20; 12,7,7). La questione della superiorità emerge infine per l’uso degli avverbi di maggioranza περισσοτέρως (cf. 2 Cor 11,23.23; 12,15) e μᾶλλον (2 Cor 12,9) e per la diffusa presenza del linguaggio del vanto, che attraversa l’intera apologia. Cf. il verbo καυχᾶσθαι in 2 Cor 10,8.13.15.16.17.17; 11,12.16.18.18.30.30; 12,1.5.5.6.9; e il sostantivo καύχησις in 2 Cor 11,10.17.

<sup>(41)</sup> Il versante dell’inferiorità è formulato mediante l’aggettivo ταπεινός (cf. 2 Cor 10,1) e il verbo ταπεινῶ (cf. 2 Cor 11,7; 12,21); il verbo ὑστερέω (cf. 2 Cor 11,5.9; 12,11) e il sostantivo ὑστέρημα (2 Cor 11,9) il verbo ἡσθενήκαμεν (2 Cor 11,21a), l’espressione εἰ καὶ οὐδὲν εἰμι (2 Cor 12,11) e il verbo ἡσσωθῆτε (2 Cor 12,13).

<sup>(42)</sup> Aspetto posto molto bene in risalto da FORBES, “Comparison”, 4: “Comparison can be made between things which are very different, such as kings and

alcuni commentatori, considerano l'interrogativo retorico di 2 Cor 11,7 come *propositio* principale di 2 Cor 11,7-21a<sup>(43)</sup>. In realtà, in base alla criteriologia che abbiamo segnalato per 2 Cor 11,5-6, in 2 Cor 11,7, mancano gli elementi di una *propositio* retorica: si tratta di una semplice domanda retorica che si fonda sul dato di fatto dell'e-vangelizzazione gratuita di Paolo per introdurre il primo dato del confronto con gli avversari con cui “manifesta” (v. 6b) la sua superiorità nell'apostolato. E in questa finalità argomentativa si spiega l'immodestia di Paolo nel rimproverare i suoi interlocutori per aver frainteso la sua gratuità con uno stato di inferiorità che rischia di squalificarlo di fronte ai suoi avversari.

La tipologia dell'immodestia in questioni economiche è diffusa nel contesto culturale greco-romano; così ricorda Menandro: “Tieni a mente il beneficio ricevuto, dimentica quello fatto” (*Sentenze* 827)<sup>(44)</sup>. E Seneca nel *De beneficiis* 2,10,4 prescrive: “La legge del beneficio fra due persone è la seguente: l'una deve dimenticare di aver dato, l'altra non deve mai dimenticare di aver ricevuto”. Dunque è come se Paolo avesse messo da parte il buon senso del non ricordare di aver dato, per accusare i Corinzi d'ingratitude e per porsi a confronto con coloro che si credono superiori ma che in realtà sfruttano e maltrattano la stessa comunità di Corinto (cf. 2 Cor 11,20)<sup>(45)</sup>. Ci troviamo di fronte ad un tratto di periautologia che rischia di suscitare reazioni di repulsione negli ascoltatori, alimentate dallo stesso ordine delle prove addotte da Paolo. Di fatto contrariamente alla tassonomia

---

commoners, but only on the basis of their common humanity. Where there is no real similarity, nor comparison can be made”.

<sup>(43)</sup> SUNDERMANN, *Der Schwache Apostel*, 98-102; THRALL, *Second Corinthians*, 681.

<sup>(44)</sup> Cf. inoltre Menandro, *Sentenze* 12: “Ingrato colui che, ricevuto un beneficio se ne dimentica”; Filone Alessandrino, *De Plantatione* 33,136: “Per colui che ringrazia è sufficiente come ricompensa lo stesso ringraziare”.

<sup>(45)</sup> Sull'identità degli avversari di Paolo in 2 Cor 10-13 cf. J.M. COURT, “The Controversy with the Adversaries of Paul's Apostolate in the Context of the Relations to the Corinthians Congregation (2 Corinthians 12,14-13,13)”, *Verteidigung und Begründung* (Hrsg. E. LOHSE) 87-106; R. PENNA, “La presenza degli avversari di Paolo in 2 Cor 10-13: esame letterario”, *L'apostolo Paolo. Studi di esegesi e teologia* (Cinisello Balsamo 1991) 299-331; A. PITTA, “Gli avversari giudeo-cristiani di Paolo”, *Ricerche Storico Bibliche* 15/2 (2003) 103-109; B.A. SCOTT, “Enslaving, Devouring, Exploiting, Self-Exalting, and Striking: 2 Cor 11:19-20 and the Tyranny of Paul's Opponents”, (SBL SP 36; Atlanta 1997) 460-490; J.L. SUMNEY, ‘*Servant of Satan*’, ‘*False Brothers*’ and *Other Opponents of Paul* (JSNT SS 188; Sheffield 1999) 79-133.

normale di una periautologia, in cui si dovrebbe procedere dalle origini (genere), alla formazione (paideia), ai costumi, per concludere con l'elenco delle proprie azioni<sup>(46)</sup>, Paolo inverte la sequenza degli eventi in modo da risultare più incisivo nelle accuse rivolte ai Corinzi e ai suoi avversari.

Si spiega così la ripresa del vocabolario sull'ἄφροσύνη, declinata con quello del "vanto secondo la carne", in 2 Cor 11,16-20: se i Corinzi hanno accolto l'immodestia degli avversari, devono essere disposti ad accogliere, da persone moderate (l'espressione del v. 19 è sarcastica), l'immoderazione e non la follia o la semplice insipienza di Paolo.

b) L'ἄφροσύνη delle credenziali e delle avversità (2 Cor 11,21b-33)

La periautologia paolina prosegue con l'elencazione delle credenziali (origine e formazione di Paolo e dei suoi avversari, in 2 Cor 11,21b-22), e delle opere compiute nel ministero per Cristo (cf. 2 Cor 11,23-29), riprendendo il normale *cursus* di una periautologia. Come abbiamo già evidenziato, il confronto con gli avversari parte dallo stato di parità (v. 22) per esaltare quello della superiorità di Paolo nel ministero (vv. 23-33). Il paragrafo è caratterizzato dall'amplificazione o dalla αὔξεισις, un'ulteriore caratteristica che ne conferma la natura periautologica, ben attestata da Aristotele: "Se di per se stesso non offre molto argomento, si deve metterlo a confronto con altri, come faceva Isocrate che non era abituato al discorso giudiziario. E bisogna confrontarlo con personaggi illustri, poiché esso produce l'amplificazione e il bello... Se non si può confrontarlo con personaggi illustri, bisogna confrontarlo con altri, poiché la superiorità è concepita per mostrare virtù" (*Rhetorica* 1,38-39,1368a).

In 2 Cor 11,21b-33 l'attenzione è rivolta non tanto sull'elenco delle credenziali di Paolo e dei suoi avversari, quanto su quello delle avversità che rappresenta il più ampio catalogo "peristatico" del suo epistolario (vv. 23-27)<sup>(47)</sup>. Ne risalta un'immoderazione (ἄφροσύνη

<sup>(46)</sup> La sequenza è rispettata ad esempio da Paolo in Fil 3,2-14, mentre in Gal 1,13-2,21 parte dalla propria formazione del giudaismo, omettendo di ricordare le sue origini. Sulla tassonomia della periautologia antica e paolina cf. ALETTI, *Philippiens*, 220; PITTA, *Galati*, 85-90.

<sup>(47)</sup> Sulla funzione dei cataloghi peristatici nell'epistolario paolino cf. J.T. FITZGERALD, *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel. An Examination of the Catalogues of Hardships in the Corinthian Correspondence* (SBL DS 99; Atlanta 1984) che dedica particolare attenzione ai cataloghi di 1 Cor 4,9-13; 2 Cor 4,7-12; 6,3-10.



al v. 21b) che raggiunge l'insensatezza (παράφρονων) di chi sembra ignorare, ancora una volta, quanto è richiesto a chi intende ricordare le proprie gesta. Da questo punto di vista è indicativo quanto raccomanda Epitteto: “Nelle conversazioni evita di ricordare troppo e in modo esagerato quello che hai fatto e quello che hai rischiato, perché se per te è bello ricordare i pericoli che hai corso, non lo è per gli altri ascoltare le cose che ti sono capitate”<sup>(48)</sup>.

Tuttavia Paolo sembra ben consapevole dell'eccessivo vanto di sé su cui si è attardato con il lungo elenco delle avversità. Per questo il paragrafo si conclude con la narrazione dell'avversità verificatasi a Damasco (vv. 31-33), di fronte alla quale si riconosce così debole da non sembrare un leader esemplare<sup>(49)</sup>. Ancora una volta è illuminante quanto prescrive Plutarco, nel suo manuale dedicato alla periautologia: “Per evitare fastidi a chi ha gli occhi malati, si cerca in qualche modo di mettere in ombra gli oggetti troppo luminosi: così alcuni, invece di ostentare le proprie lodi in tutta la loro luce e purezza, vi insinuano difetti, errori e mancanze leggere, eliminando la possibilità di attirarsi invidia e irritazione” (*Invidiam laudando, Moralia* 13F, 543).

Pertanto la narrazione della fuga da Damasco (vv. 32-33) non rappresenta affatto un corpo estraneo nella periautologia paolina, di cui s'ignorerebbe la ragion d'essere<sup>(50)</sup> né tanto meno una glossa successiva<sup>(51)</sup>, bensì costituisce l'importante contrappeso che bilancia l'immoderazione a cui è stato costretto Paolo, per non suscitare il rifiuto da parte dei suoi interlocutori.

### c) Λ ἄφοσύνη delle visioni e delle rivelazioni (2 Cor 12,1-10)

L'ultimo paragrafo delle prove addotte da Paolo a propria difesa è incentrato sul vanto delle visioni e delle rivelazioni (2 Cor 12,1-10). Questa volta la posta in gioco è molto alta, in quanto si tratta di un ambito che può essere tacciato, soprattutto nel contesto culturale di Corinto, come una forma di ὑβρις o di tracotanza irrispettosa della trascendenza divina, che rasenta l'empietà<sup>(52)</sup>. Tale background in-

<sup>(48)</sup> EPITTETO, *Manuale* 14.

<sup>(49)</sup> Aspetto posto ben in risalto da B.A. SCOTT, “Too Weak to Lead: The Form and Function of 2 Cor 11,23b-33”, *NTS* 41 (1995) 263-276.

<sup>(50)</sup> Con buona pace di BULTMANN, *Der zweite Brief*, 219-220.

<sup>(51)</sup> Così invece H. WINDISCH, *Der zweite Korintherbrief* (KEK; Göttingen 1924) 363-364 che attribuisce la narrazione al segretario della lettera.

<sup>(52)</sup> Si noti l'uso del sostantivo ὑβρις nel breve elenco peristatico di 2 Cor 12,10 per accennare all'oltraggio inflittogli dagli avversari: è l'unico riferimento nei cataloghi peristatici paolini.

duce Paolo a vantarsi delle visioni e delle rivelazioni utilizzando la terza singolare nei vv. 2-4-5a invece della normale I singolare<sup>(53)</sup>, riservando quest'ultima al vanto nelle debolezze, esemplificate dalla famosa "spina nella carne" (vv. 5b-10). E come per il contrappeso tra l'elenco delle avversità e l'episodio di Damasco (cf. 2 Cor 11,21b-33), così l'episodio del rapimento (vv. 2-5) sino al terzo cielo è bilanciato, con grande strategia retorica, dalla spina nella carne e/o dalle percosse inflittele dall'angelo di satana (vv. 7-8).

Per la nostra questione è decisivo il significato che egli conferisce al vanto delle visioni e delle rivelazioni: se si vantasse di queste non risulterebbe "immoderato" (ἄφρων), ossia al di sopra di quanto gli altri possono vedere o ascoltare, ma attesterebbe soltanto la verità (v. 6). In questo caso dovrebbe essere chiaro che il confronto non verte sulla pazzia o sulla follia di Paolo rispetto a quella degli avversari, il che non avrebbe alcun significato, bensì sulla moderazione o sull'immoderazione nel vantarsi in modo proprio o improprio, secondo la carne o "nel Signore" (cf. 2 Cor 10,17), riprendendo la principale posta in gioco della confutazione paolina (cf. 2 Cor 10,7-17).

\*  
\* \* \*

L'identificazione di una *propositio* retorica nell'epistolario paolino è di primaria importanza: in caso contrario o sbagliato, si rischia di smarrire l'intricato ordito delle sue dimostrazioni. La tesi principale di 2 Cor 11,5-6 rappresenta il filo conduttore di quello che stiamo definendo come "discorso immoderato" o "immodesto" e non del "pazzo" né dello stolto o dell'insipiente. Paolo non si finge affatto folle per es-

<sup>(53)</sup> Per M.D. GOULDER, "Vision and Revelation of the Lord (2 Corinthians 12:1-10)", *Paul and the Corinthians*. Studies on a Community in Conflict. Festschrift M. Thrall (eds. T.J. BURKE – J.K. ELLIOTT) (NTS 109; Leiden 2003) 303-312 la terza persona singolare si riferirebbe ad un amico e non a Paolo stesso. L'ipotesi è poco sostenibile di fronte al genere periautologico della sezione: sarebbe come vantarsi di ciò che appartiene ad altri! Invece l'identificazione autobiografica della terza persona è già stata sostenuta dall'Ambrosiaster, *Commento alla Seconda lettera ai Corinzi* (ed. L. FATICA) (ctp 79; Roma 1989) 140, per essere confermata nei contributi di Furnisch, *II Corinthians*, 524; A.T. LINCOLN, *Paradiso ora e non ancora*. Cielo e prospettiva escatologica nel pensiero di Paolo (Brescia 1985) 133; MATERA, *II Corinthians*, 277; M. THRALL, "Paul's Journey to Paradise. Some Exegetical Issues in 2 Cor 12.2-4", *The Corinthians Correspondence* (ed. R. BIERINGER) (BETL 125; Leuven 1996) 548; O. WISCHMEYER, "2 Korinther 12,1-10. Ein autobiographisch-theologischer Text des Paulus", *Von Ben Sira zu Paulus*. Gesammelte Aufsätze zu Texten. Theologie und Hermeneutik des Frühjudentums und des Neuen Testaments (Hrsg. E.-M. Becker) (WUNT 173; Tübingen 2004) 279.

sere accolto nuovamente, con il suo vangelo, a Corinto, bensì entra nello stesso campo degli avversari per intessere il discorso più immoderato che abbia dettato. La sua è una periautologia “secondo la carne” che accetta la sfida dell’immoderazione o della mancanza della misura, propria dei suoi avversari, così da sconfiggerli con le loro stesse armi.

Resta un dato che preferisce non affrontare direttamente; rispondere alla calunnia di 2 Cor 10,10, giacché secondo gli avversari la sua presenza fisica è debole e il suo λόγος ἐξουθενημένος o “disprezzabile”. Anzi nella tesi principale del discorso immoderato Paolo riconosce che è ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ: un dato di connessione che conferma la natura e la funzione di 2 Cor 11,5-6. In realtà la *probatio* risponde in modo indiretto alla calunnia, spostando l’attenzione sulla sua gratuità nel ministero, sul *sermo corporis* più che sulle capacità retoriche puramente verbali<sup>(54)</sup>, e sulla permanenza della potenza di Cristo nella sua debolezza, nonostante sia stato rapito sino al terzo cielo.

In definitiva il riconoscimento nell’essere incolto nella parola lo colloca sulla stessa traiettoria di quanto asserisce Isocrate all’inizio del suo panegirico: “Eppure certe persone criticano i discorsi inaccessibili agli incolti e troppo elaborati... Vedo che negli esordi gli altri oratori si arruffiano l’uditorio e si scusano fin da subito di quello che stanno per dire; alcuni giurano di trovarsi costretti ad improvvisare, altri puntano sulla difficoltà dell’elocuzione... Io invece vi esorto caldamente a non concedermi alcuna scusante, anzi, a ridere di me e a disprezzarmi se non parlo in modo consentaneo all’argomento”<sup>(55)</sup>.

Liberata dagli orpelli di una retorica evanescente e verbosa, quella di Paolo resta un’arte della persuasione dall’altissimo spessore contenutistico, in quanto funzionale alla difesa del suo ministero e del suo vangelo; e il discorso immoderato ne attesta la notevole capacità di far parlare la conoscenza di Cristo correndo il rischio di pronunciare la periautologia più immoderata del suo epistolario.

Pontificia Facoltà Teologica  
Italia Meridionale,  
Viale Colli Aminei, 2  
80131 Napoli

Antonio PITTA

<sup>(54)</sup> Sulla tipologia del *sermo corporis* nella letteratura greco-romana cf. J.A. GLANCY, “Boasting of Beating (2 Corinthians 11:23-25)”, *JBL* 123 (2004) 99-135.

<sup>(55)</sup> ISOCRATE, *Panegirico* 11-14. Cf. anche quanto riconosce, a proposito del suo stile poco elegante o carente di asteismo, DIONE CRISOSTOMO, *Orazioni* 42,3: “...Soprattutto rispetto ai discorsi, mi riconosco come incolto (ἰδιώτης)”.

## SUMMARY

Forced to defend himself from the slanders spread by his adversaries in Corinth Paul accepts in 2 Cor 11,1–12,18 their challenge and draws a comparison situated on the razor's edge of the *periautologia* or of self-praise. More than being a fool's speech his discourse is an immoderate one and it stands up only because Paul's competitors lack measure and moderation. The main thesis of the section (2 Cor 11,5-6) announces an apology of Paul's superiority which will be proved not by means of verbose or empty elocution but by the facts: gratuity in evangelization, ministerial relationships with Christ, visions and revelations, all of them balanced by means of a paradoxical boasting in one's own weakness.

# ANIMADVERSIONES

## Working Together with Whom? Text-Critical, Contextual, and Theological Analysis of συνεργεῖ in Romans 8,28

Romans 8,28 is nestled within Paul's larger theological discourse on adoption, suffering and the future security of God's people in Christ. English translations of this verse leave little doubt as to the sense of the passage, namely, under the careful watch of God's providence, good is the *telos* of all things in the life of those known by Christ. And, with good reason, matters could be left at that<sup>(1)</sup>. When one, however, looks at the Greek text alongside the secondary literature on this verse, its enigmatic nature rises to the surface. While the general idea of the verse is typically agreed upon, the specifics of the verse are debated. The following is not a full-orbed exegesis of Rom 8,28 and its surrounding context. Rather, it is a modest proposal for a reading making good contextual, grammatical and theological sense.

\*  
\* \* \*

The first puzzling question is the acting agent of the συνεργεῖ. Is it πάντα, θεός, or the πνεῦμα of vv. 26-27? Coupled with this textually elusive question is the equally perplexing understanding of the verb itself. Is συνεργεῖ a transitive or intransitive verb? Are persons or things working together for something (intransitive) or causing things to work together (transitive). These are the typical questions asked of this verse and this verb in particular. The general options presented by most commentators, for which Fitzmyer will serve our purposes, are 1) θεός is the subject of the intransitive verb συνεργεῖ, therefore, God works together with all things<sup>(2)</sup>. 2) θεός is the subject of the transitive verb συνεργεῖ and πάντα is functioning as the direct object. "God works all things". 3) θεός, which is the better reading is omitted, and πάντα is the subject of the intransitive verb. "All things work together for good"<sup>(3)</sup>. Or 4) the πνεῦμα is the subject with an intransitive verb. "The Spirit works with all things for those who love God"<sup>(4)</sup>.

(1) Though recognizing the text-critical complexity of this verse, Wilckens states, "Der Sinn des Satzes ist auf jeden Fall auch in der kurzen LA der gleiche; ohne Gott kann nichts zum Guten verhelfen", U. WILCKENS, *Der Brief an die Römer* (EKK; Neukirchen 1987) II, 163.

(2) J.A. FITZMYER, *Romans*. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 33; New York 1992) 523.

(3) One can safely say this is the majority opinion. To name a few: Morris, Barrett, Cranfield, Hendriksen, Fitzmyer, Schreiner, Michel, Lohse.

(4) G.D. FEE, *God's Empowering Presence*. The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul (Peabody 1994) 587-591 and M. BLACK, "The Interpretation of Rom viii 28",

Every major commentator on this verse has a certain angle on this issue, with the majority of scholars recognizing the ambiguous nature of the verb and its subject settling with option three. Without rehearsing the arguments in detail, πάντα as the subject of the συνεργεῖ is understood as the most natural way of reading the verse. The text-critical argument typically follows this line of reasoning. The shorter reading, where θεός is omitted, is supported by Ⲛ C D F G Ψ ̅̅̅̅ and the Latin, Syriac, and Bohairic traditions. This is weighty textual evidence and is not to be taken lightly<sup>(5)</sup>. The longer reading, where θεός comes after the verb, is supported by ̅̅̅̅<sup>46</sup> A B 81 sa (Coptic) and Origen. Again, these are very good and ancient mss and also should not be taken lightly<sup>(6)</sup>. The shorter reading is more attested and falls under the text-critical criterion *brevior lectio probabilior*<sup>(7)</sup>.

On this basis, commentators tend to side with the shorter reading and understand πάντα as the subject because it represents the path of least resistance. But the jury is still out on many of these issues and the tension is often felt when reading commentators' reflections on the subject<sup>(8)</sup>. For example, in Keck's recent and well-received commentary on Romans, he states rather matter-of-factly, "Of these, 'all things' is the least probable (though preferred by Moo [1996] and defended by Cranfield [1975])" <sup>(9)</sup>. In other words, this text is a classic example where text-critical arguments and internal evidence may be at loggerheads.

\*  
\* \*

The problem, in this author's estimation, resides precisely with the συν of the συνεργεῖ. Mindful of Cranfield's warning about relying on the etymology of this verb over against its context, one could argue that this particular verb, at least within the Pauline corpus, carries the idea of agents working together. This is especially seen in the following: 1 Cor 16,16; 2 Cor 6,1. Gieniusz observes that all the compounds with συν- in 8,18-30 are associated with the idea of "together with" <sup>(10)</sup>. As will be shown, this is the case in Rom 8,28 as

---

*Neotestamentica et Patristica*. Eine Freundesgabe, Herrn Professor Dr. Oscar Cullmann zu seinem 60 Geburtstag Überreicht (ed.) (SNT 6; Leiden 1962) 166-72. This may be the least plausible understanding because of the contextual difficulties of vv. 29-30 where God is clearly the subject. See A. GIENIUSZ, C. R., *Romans 8:18-30: "Suffering Does Not Thwart the Future Glory"* (University of South Florida International Studies in Formative Christianity and Judaism; Atlanta 1999) 255.

<sup>(5)</sup> See B. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart 1994) 458.

<sup>(6)</sup> See the comment in the lexical entry for συνεργεῖ in BDAG, 969. Matthew Black makes the rather odd argument that ὁ θεός is a difficult reading because it "immediately" follows τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν τὸν θεόν. Black states that Paul is surely not so poor a stylist as to make this mistake (BLACK, "The Interpretation of Romans viii 28", 168.) But ὁ θεός does not "immediately" follow τὸν θεόν. Rather, it follows πάντα συνεργεῖ in the mss supporting this reading (cf. Rom 8,33).

<sup>(7)</sup> It should be noted that Sanday and Headlam prefer the reading ὁ θεός because it is deemed the *lectio difficilior*. W. SANDAY – A. HEADLAM, *Romans* (ICC; Edinburgh 1980) 215.

<sup>(8)</sup> See the comments by MORRIS, *Romans* (PNTC; Grand Rapids 1988) 330-331.

<sup>(9)</sup> L. KECK, *Romans* (ANTC; Nashville 2005) 216.

<sup>(10)</sup> GIENIUSZ, *Romans 8:18-30*, 257. This at least calls into question the following statement by Lohse: "Im Verb συνεργεῖν liegt kein Ton auf συν- (Zusammenwirken von

well. Someone or something is working together with someone else in a synergistic fashion.

Συνεργεῖ does intimate a collaboration among various agents, and this tends to rule out the majority position that πάντα is the subject of συνεργεῖ. One of the problems with reading πάντα as the subject of the intransitive verb is that συνεργεῖ in the Pauline literature takes a personal subject, not an impersonal one such as πάντα<sup>(11)</sup>. Coupled with this is the loss of the collaborative idea taking place contextually if one observes πάντα as the subject. Also, the argument of Dodd, Knox, and Black against reading πάντα as the subject because of the “evolutionary optimism” introduced by this reading which is so foreign to the Pauline outlook is still found persuasive<sup>(12)</sup>. It would seem quite odd within the Pauline logic for “all things” to be collaborating with themselves.

The reading of this verse that will be argued for here is rather simple. God is the subject of συνεργεῖ as in some witnesses (as attested in ℘<sup>46</sup>, A, B, etc.) or as the implied subject from v. 27a (the one searching the hearts)<sup>(13)</sup>. This reading is warranted either within the textual tradition or within the context of the preceding and subsequent verses of Paul’s thought. Resultantly, πάντα, as argued by Black (and others), is an accusative of respect<sup>(14)</sup>. In this sense the action of “working together” takes place with respect to “all things”<sup>(15)</sup>. The verse understood this way would state: “In all things God is working together for the good of the ones loving him”.

\*  
\* \* \*

---

Gott und Mensch), sondern das Kompositum verstärkt die Aussage = ‘verhelfen,’ ‘förderlich sein’”. E. Lohse, *Der Brief an die Römer* (KEK IV/15; Göttingen 2004) 254 n. 48. As far as the comment about God working together with humanity, there is agreement. Regarding the irrelevance of the συν, questions can be raised.

<sup>(11)</sup> Cf. Mark 16,20; 1 Cor 16,16; 2 Cor 6,1; see Mark 16,20. In Jas 2,22 συνεργεῖ takes a non-personal subject but is clearly operating with a cooperative idea, i.e., faith and works. See FEE, *God’s Empowering Presence*, 588. Fee bolsters the argument by noting that Paul never uses πάντα as the subject of an active verb. Likewise, when πάντα is used as the object of a personal verb, it almost always precedes the verb. Fee (588) states, “These factors of usage alone would seem to spell the death knell to the traditional reading, ‘all things work together for good’”.

<sup>(12)</sup> BLACK, “Rom viii 28,” 168; cf. N.T. WRIGHT, “Romans” (NIB IX; Nashville 2004) 600. Wright acknowledges the sheer oddity of reading πάντα as the subject of συνεργεῖ.

<sup>(13)</sup> See WRIGHT, “Romans”, 600; C.D. OSBURN, “The Interpretation of Romans 8:28”, *WTJ* 44 (1982) 109. Schreiner probably overstates the case when he argues that Οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι is a paragraph indicator separating v. 28 from the preceding verses. Wright states, and correctly in my estimation, that the introductory δε is not the “but” of opposition, but of “logic” (WRIGHT, *Romans*, 600). In other words, Paul is continuing his argument from the preceding verses. This also makes good sense in light of the referent of πάντα in vv. 18-27 (cf. FITZMYER, *Romans*, 522). Fee (*God’s Empowering Presence*, 589-90) understands the Οἶδαμεν δὲ as a direct response to the οὐκ οἶδαμεν of v. 26 (see also, GIENIUSZ, *Romans* 8:18-30, 253-54). In this light, Paul is specifically addressing the unveiled ignorance of vv. 26-27.

<sup>(14)</sup> See also BDAG, 969.

<sup>(15)</sup> S.E. PORTER, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition* (JSOT; Sheffield 1994) 90.



One pressing question remains, however. If θεός is the subject, stated or implied, with whom then is he working<sup>(16)</sup>? This answer to this particular question is where this article is seeking to advance a new notion. It is grammatically possible to understand God's working together with τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν τὸν θεόν (cf. Jas 2,22). But this is awkward contextually and tends to lose the theocentricity of Paul's thought. It also loses the beneficiary idea associated with the ones loving God. In other words, it does not follow for human agency to be associated with the συν because of the *extra nos* emphasis of God's salvific work in Christ in this section. Nor do humans have the capacity to work in such a way that all things are in their realm of influence, the all things realm is the realm of God<sup>(17)</sup>. Paul is speaking exclusively about God's definitive and gracious movement toward his people, and this should offer some control on our interpretation and translation.

It is proposed here that v. 28 follows from vv. 26-27 according to Pauline logic, and the one with whom God is working for the good of those who love God is the one who in v. 27 is κατὰ θεὸν ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἁγίων<sup>(18)</sup>. It is, after all, the Spirit who is the one interceding on behalf of God's people, and he intercedes κατὰ θεόν. Contextually, one already observes the synergetic relationship between the work of the Spirit and the work of God. Therefore, the change of subject taking place in v. 28 from πνεῦμα to θεός is real but not disjunctive<sup>(19)</sup>. The collaborative idea associated with the verb συνεργεῖ is between the Spirit's activity on behalf of the saints according to God's will (v. 27), and God's providential care for his people via the Spirit's activity. God's people in Christ are the beneficiaries of God's working together with the Spirit on their behalf.

On these grounds, it is possible to see a Trinitarian dynamic up and running in Rom 8,28 where the work of God and the Spirit overlap in a perichoretic way. When one enters into discussions of God's providence from a doctrinal perspective, we are immediately in the realm of creation and God's preserving of his creation via the Spirit. Romans 8,28 is contextually placed in Paul's theological reflection about creation, suffering, the limits of humanity, and the sufficiency of the Spirit's interceding for and preserving of creation and God's people. This reading highlights the climactic role Rom 8,28 plays in its context. In all things, God is working together with the Spirit for the good purposes of his people.

\*  
\* \*

In light of the grammatical, textual, logical and theological issues at hand, this reading makes good sense in Paul's overall argument in this context. At

<sup>(16)</sup> We are assuming the transitive idea (cf. NASB) does not do justice to the synergetic idea of this verb and is an unknown usage in Greek literature (see GIENIUSZ, *Romans* 8:18-30, 255; J.G. GRIFFITHS, "Romans viii.28", *ExpTim* 49 [1938] 474-76).

<sup>(17)</sup> Thanks to Dr. Tee Gatewood for this insight.

<sup>(18)</sup> Cf. n. 14.

<sup>(19)</sup> In this light, the sensibilities, but not the conclusion, of Black and Fee are affirmed.

<sup>(20)</sup> Thanks to Dr. Frank Thielmann, Dr. Tee Gatewood, Dr. Gregg Morrison, and Dr. Jonathan Pennington for offering helpful comments on this article.

the same time, it answers some of the difficult lexical and grammatical questions related to this verse and is in this sense a *proposed* reading. A working translation might be: “And we know that in all things God is working together (with the Spirit) for good to those loving God”.

Beeson Divinity School (Samford University)  
800 Lakeshore Drive  
Birmingham, Alabama 35229; USA

Mark S. GIGNILLIAT

#### SUMMARY

Who is actually working together with whom in Romans 8,28? The overall sense of the text is rather straightforward. For the ones loving God, good is the ultimate end of all things. The clarity stops here, however, as exegetes wrestle with the actual syntactic understanding of the verb and subject of *συνεργεῖ*. This short note advances an argument which seeks to show God as the subject of the intransitive verb *συνεργεῖ* with an understanding of the Spirit of Romans 8,26-27 as the one with whom God is working<sup>(20)</sup>.

## The Promises to the Conquerors in the Book of Revelation

Considerable scholarly attention has been devoted to the letters to seven Asian churches in chapters 2 and 3 of the book of Revelation. Prominent among the subjects debated are the promises found at the close of each letter for those in the churches who “conquer” and remain faithful. Every promise follows a similar formula. The sentence starts with a present participle of νικάω (τῷ νικῶντι or ὁ νικῶν) followed (usually directly) by a future indicative in the first person<sup>(1)</sup>. The imagery of these promises has prompted substantial research. Unexpectedly, however, the promises are virtually always studied in isolation and the question of coherence between the promises is rarely addressed by commentators.

Scholars nonetheless recognize that νικάω (“to conquer”, “overcome”, “prevail”) plays a rather significant role in the Apocalypse<sup>(2)</sup>. At critical junctures in the book we find the verb (outside of chapters 2 and 3 in 6,2; 11,7; 12,11; 13,7; 15,2; 17,14; 21,7) and some have seen a chiasmic structure in these occurrences<sup>(3)</sup>. At any rate, the very last occurrence of the verb (21,7) is in a formula similar to what we find in chapters 2 and 3. All of this suggests that the promises to the conquerors may have been something more than isolated *ad hoc* inventions and might somehow cohere. In this paper we will argue that there is indeed cohesion between the promises to the conquerors in that the author draws a salvation-historical line by basing the promises on successive events in the biblical story. I hope that the interpretative approach I suggest in this article will be able to open new avenues in the debate over the significance of the sometimes obscure passages under scrutiny.

### 1. The Salvation-Historical Framework: Ephesus and Laodicea

The promise to the first church and the promise to the last church are among the most readily intelligible. The first, to the conquerors at Ephesus, grants them “to eat of the tree of life, which is in the paradise of God” (2,7). Reference is made a number of times to similar trees in Jewish literature (e.g. *1 En* 25,5; *T.Lev* 18,11). All of these (including Rev 2,7) refer back to Gen 2,9, which narrates the creation of paradise with the tree of life at its centre. Thus, the first promise refers to the very start of the biblical narrative: the creation. The last promise (to the Laodiceans) refers to the ministry and subsequent enthronement of Jesus: “to the one who conquers I will give a place with me on my throne, just as I myself conquered and sat down with my Father on his throne” (3,21). This episode was evidently the last chapter of the biblical narrative so far (seen from a primitive Christian perspective). Hence, we find that the promises start with a reference to the very start of the

<sup>(1)</sup> Except for 2,11 and 3,5 which are passive and therefore use the third person.

<sup>(2)</sup> See E. LOHMEYER, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* (Tübingen <sup>2</sup>1953) 23; F.J. MURPHY, *Fallen is Babylon* (Harrisburg 1998) 103; H.B. SWETE, *The Apocalypse of St. John* (London <sup>3</sup>1909) 29.

<sup>(3)</sup> J.L. TRAFTON, *Reading Revelation* (Macon <sup>2</sup>2005) XII, 202.

biblical story, creation, and end with a reference to its latest section, the ministry and exaltation of Jesus.

A note on methodology is in order. These two events (creation and exaltation) might not be the only ones alluded to in the promises. The author often displays the habit of weaving together various allusions. There may be, for example, a reference to the Zenonid dynasty, a Laodicean family, in 3,21 as well<sup>(4)</sup>. This would mark the promise as especially appropriate for this church, for John is above all concerned with the actual situation of the churches. The primary reference is, nevertheless, usually clear (as it certainly is in this case), and we will take this primary reference as our point of departure.

Having established the commencement (creation) and the conclusion (ministry and exaltation of Jesus) of the salvation-historical line, we will now explore how the other promises fit into this scheme.

## 2. The Promise to Smyrna: No Second Death

The promise given to the conquerors at Smyrna, that they “will not be harmed by the second death” (2,11) is notoriously hard to expound. Both Greek (e.g. Plutarch, *Moralia* 942 F) and Jewish sources (e.g. *Tg. Ps.-J. Jer* 51,39) witness to the idea, but no one background is directly applicable to Rev 2,11<sup>(5)</sup>. Some see a parallel to the occurrences of “second death” in Rev 20 in the targumic tradition on Isa 65<sup>(6)</sup>. The context there is God’s renewal of creation “to a perfection of nature like that in the Garden of Eden before the expulsion of Adam and Eve”<sup>(7)</sup>. Whether the targum on Isa 65 is relevant to Rev 2,11 or not, notions associated with creation and fall are close at hand if the subject is death and whether one will be harmed by it or not. The entrance of death into biblical history is found in Gen 2,17, where it is said of the “tree of the knowledge of good and evil” that “in the day that you eat of it you shall die”. Once the first human couple has eaten, however, they do not literally die that same day but are cursed and driven out of Eden. It can be little more than a suspicion in the absence of any clear evidence, but it seems possible that John connected the notion of first and second death with the strange, partial death of the first human couple. This may coincide with a number of occurrences of “second death” in Jewish literature. See, for instance, *Frg. Tg. P* (MS Paris 110) Deut 33,6: “Let Reuben live in this world and die not in the second death in which death the wicked die in the world to come”<sup>(8)</sup>. Here, not dying a second death may be equal to living in this world. This implies that the first death preceded living in this world. Accordingly, this first death could be the death of Gen 2,17 that Adam and Eve died upon entrance into this world (as opposed to Eden).

<sup>(4)</sup> As maintained by C.J. HEMER, *The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia in their Local Setting* (JSNTSupp. 11; Sheffield 1986) 201-217.

<sup>(5)</sup> Cf. D.E. AUNE, *Revelation 17–22* (WBC; Nashville 1998) 1092-1093; HEMER, *Letters*, 75-76.

<sup>(6)</sup> M. McNAMARA, *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch* (AnBib 27; Rome 1966) 123-125. Followed by G.K. BEALE, *The Book of Revelation* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids – Carlisle 1999) 1036.

<sup>(7)</sup> J.D.W. WATTS, *Isaiah 34–66* (WBC; Waco 1987) 357.

<sup>(8)</sup> Translation and discussion in McNAMARA, *Palestinian Targum*, 120-121.

### 3. *The Promise to Pergamum: From Genesis to Exodus*

Compared to the other churches, the promise to the conquerors at Pergamum is rather long: “to everyone who conquers I will give some of the hidden manna, and I will give a white stone, and on the white stone is written a new name that no one knows except the one who receives it” (2,17). The meaning of the manna is relatively straightforward<sup>(9)</sup>; it refers to the pot of manna stored up in the ark (Exod 16,32-34). That it was “hidden” (ἀκρομυμένον) can refer either to its usually invisible position in the ark or to the tradition that it was hidden along with the other sacred vessels shortly before the destruction of the temple (cf. 2 Macc 2,4-8; 2 Bar 6,5-9)<sup>(10)</sup>. The white stone with the unknown new name written on it has presented interpreters with far more difficulties. Many interpretations have been suggested, none really satisfactorily<sup>(11)</sup>. One of these interpretations proposes that Rev 2,17 refers to the stones on the ephod of the high priest<sup>(12)</sup>. Each of the two stones on the ephod had six of the twelve tribes’ names inscribed on it (Exod 28,9-10; 28-29). This view is usually rejected by commentators on the argument that the stones mentioned in Exod 28,9-10 are not white<sup>(13)</sup>. Indeed, the MT describes the stones as שָׁהָם, which can now, on the basis of Akkadian evidence be identified as red coloured<sup>(14)</sup>. However, early translations show that the rendering of שָׁהָם has long been uncertain. The LXX translates the eleven occurrences of the word with seven different Greek terms, the most frequent of which are σμάρραγδος (3x); σάρδιον (2x) and βηρύλλιον (2x). In Exod 28,9 σμάρραγδος is used, but a little further on (in vs. 20) we have βηρύλλιον. Interestingly, *Tg. Onq.* and *Tg. Ps.-J.* also translate שָׁהָם (in Exod 28,9) with בִּירְלָא, beryl<sup>(15)</sup>. Beryl is a white, colourless stone. It is described as well-known, white and valuable in *Cyranides* 1.2.6. That the targums (and sometimes the LXX as well) translate the difficult word in the same way makes it conceivable that John understood שָׁהָם as beryl, and hence thought that the stones with the names of the tribes on them were white. This additional evidence strengthens the case that the reference in Rev 2,17 is indeed to Exod 28,9-10. It would, in any event, fit the context very well; the first part of the promise refers to the manna kept in the holy of holies and the second part to the stones on the ephod which was kept in the same place<sup>(16)</sup>. If, as we shall

<sup>(9)</sup> So S. SMALLEY, *The Revelation to John* (Leicester 2005) 70.

<sup>(10)</sup> Another possibility is that John thought of the manna as hidden from the beginning of creation, in a way similar to, e.g., the Palestinian targumim on Exodus 16,4 (on which see B.J. MALINA, *The Palestinian Manna Tradition* [AGJU 7; Leiden 1968] 101).

<sup>(11)</sup> Cf. D.E. AUNE, *Revelation 1–5* (WBC; Dallas 1997) 109: “The precise meaning of this ‘white stone’ remains uncertain”. An extensive discussion can be found in HEMER, *Letters*, 94-104.

<sup>(12)</sup> Advocated by, e.g., I.T. BECKWITH, *The Apocalypse of John* (New York 1919) 462-463.

<sup>(13)</sup> So R.H. CHARLES, *Revelation* (Edinburgh 1920) I, 66. Similarly L. MORRIS, *The Book of Revelation* (Grand Rapids 1987) 68. Cf R.H. MOUNCE, *The Book of Revelation* (NICNT; Grand Rapids 1998) 83.

<sup>(14)</sup> Cf. “שָׁהָם”, HALOT.

<sup>(15)</sup> At least one modern translation (the French *Traduction œcuménique de la Bible*, 1988) does the same. *Tg. Neof.* avoids the problem and simply translates אֲבִנֵּי זָהָב (“precious stones”).

<sup>(16)</sup> Cf. 2 Bar 6,7.

argue, the salvation-historical line is tenable in the case of the next prophecies, there is yet additional support for this interpretation, since now John does not give a second promise wholly unconnected to the first, but follows a coherent approach by referring to the same episode in salvation-history. A last point in favour of this interpretation is that Rev 21–22 takes up many themes of chapters 2 and 3 (tree of life in 22,2.9; second death in 21,8; book of life in 20,15, etc.), and while there is no explicit reference to a white stone in these chapters, John does draw heavily on the high priestly attire when he describes the city as adorned with twelve stones in Rev 21,19–20. This passage is based on the description of the “breastpiece of judgment” in Exod 28,17–20<sup>(17)</sup>. A good case can therefore be made that in Rev 2,17, John is using Exod 28,9–10.

As in the promise to Laodicea discussed above, there are probably other subsidiary allusions present here as well. The notion of a new, secret name is not found in Exod 28, but is a Johannine theme that occurs elsewhere in the book (3,12; 14,1; 17,5; 19,12.13.16) and is here interlaced with the reference to the stones. It could have been prompted in this context as an adaptation of the names of the twelve tribes written on the stones of Exod 28. It is noteworthy that the twelve foundation stones of the wall of the new Jerusalem (described in Rev 21,14) feature the names of the twelve apostles<sup>(18)</sup>.

#### 4. *The Promise to Thyatira: Balaam's Prophecy*

At Thyatira another promise of considerable length is delivered: “I will give authority over the nations to rule them with an iron rod, as when clay pots are shattered even as I also received authority from my Father. To the one who conquers I will also give the morning star” (2,26–28). As with the preceding promise two things are promised here: the authority connected with the iron rod and the morning star. Again, both are best understood not in isolation but in connection with each other. Though there is evidently an allusion to Ps 2,8–9 in the reference to the iron rod, the only pertinent Old Testament text that shares both a rod and a star is Num 24,17, part of the prophecy of Balaam. The theme of rod/scepter and star introduced here became prominent in the later Jewish tradition<sup>(19)</sup>. John has strengthened the messianic overtones in Balaam's prophecy by referring to the messianic Ps 2 (cf. Rev 12,5) and by introducing the equally messianic morning star (cf. Rev 22,16)<sup>(20)</sup>. That which holds the text together is evidently the reference to Num 24,17. That Balaam's prophecy is referred to shortly after his name has been explicitly mentioned (Rev 2,14) only strengthens our case.

#### 5. *The Promise to Sardis: Back to Sinai*

“If you conquer, you will be clothed like them in white robes, and I will not blot your name out of the book of life; I will confess your name before

<sup>(17)</sup> See also Rev 4,3.

<sup>(18)</sup> See BEALE, *The Book of Revelation*, 258, on Exod 28,9–12 as a possible background for the new name.

<sup>(19)</sup> Cf. J.J. COLLINS, *The Scepter and the Star*. The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and other Ancient Literature (New York 1995) 63–64.

<sup>(20)</sup> See HEMER, *Letters*, 125.

my Father and before his angels" (3,5). This promise, given to the believers at Sardis, starts with a general feature: the conquerors will be clothed in white. There are almost limitless possibilities if one looks for people clothed in white in antiquity<sup>(21)</sup>.

A more useful starting point is therefore the promise not to blot out the names of the believers from the book of life. This points back to Exod 32,32-33<sup>(22)</sup>, where Moses, after descending from mount Sinai, sees the idolatry of the people with the golden calf and says to God: "But now, if you will only forgive their sin - but if not, blot me out of the book that you have written". To which YHWH responds: "Whoever has sinned against me I will blot out of my book". This reference is especially appropriate here, since Sardis is by far the church in the worst shape; nowhere is Jesus' message harsher. Still, the conquerors are given the chance to escape the fate of being blotted out of the book of life.

We have seen in the earlier messages that if more than one element is promised, they are somehow connected to each another. How the white clothes and the angels are related here to Exod 32,32-33 we can only surmise. Possibly the reference to angels was prompted by the following verse (Exod 32,34), where Moses, by way of vindication, is told: "my angel shall go in front of you". The white robes or garments might refer to the washed clothes that the people had to wear at God's appearance at Sinai (Exod 19,10,14)<sup>(23)</sup>. John could well have understood the people to be wearing these white clothes in their idolatry of the golden calf, just as the believers at Sardis wore white clothes before they compromised themselves (see Rev 3,4: "a few persons... have not soiled their clothes").

## 6. *The Promise to Philadelphia and the Jerusalem Temple*

The conquerors in Philadelphia are told: "I will make you a pillar in the temple of my God; you will never go out of it. I will write on you the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, the new Jerusalem that comes down from my God out of heaven, and my own new name" (Rev 3,12). Whatever else this promise may be about, it is unquestionably concerned with the temple and the temple city, Jerusalem. The pillars mentioned may or may not refer to the named pillars (Boaz and Jachin) described in 1 Kgs 7,21<sup>(24)</sup>. What is central to us here, as elsewhere, is the primary context that is referred to, which is in this case indubitably that of the Jerusalem temple.

## 7. *Summary*

Our findings up till now may be conveniently summarized by the following scheme:

<sup>(21)</sup> Cf. AUNE, *Revelation 1-5*, 223. See also J. LUZARRAGA, *Las tradiciones de la nube en la biblia y en el judaismo primitivo* (AnBib 54; Rome 1973) 196-197, 231.

<sup>(22)</sup> So also CHARLES, *Revelation*, I, 84.

<sup>(23)</sup> That white clothes are in fact washed clothes is probable in light of Rev 7,14: "They have washed their robes and made them white" (Cf. 22,14).

<sup>(24)</sup> Cf. A.M. FARRER, *The Revelation of St. John the Divine* (Clarendon 1964) 81, and the literature cited in G. STEVENSON, *Power and Place. Temple and Identity in the Book of Revelation* (BZBW 107; Berlin 2001) 245.



Promise to:	Primary reference:	Content:
Ephesus (2,7)	Gen 2,9	Tree of life in paradise
Smyrna (2,11)	Gen 2,17	No (second) death
Pergamum (2,17)	Exod 16,32-34; 28,9-10; 28-29	Sacred objects in the holy of holies of the tabernacle
Thyatira (2,26-28)	Num 24,17	Balaam's messianic prophecy
Sardis (3,5)	Exod 32,32-33 (34)	The (idolatrous) events at Sinai
Philadelphia (3,12)	–	The Jerusalem Temple
Laodicea (3,21)	–	Ministry and exaltation of Jesus

Though it is, admittedly, impossible to be equally certain about every primary reference deduced above, we are well justified in observing that the promises at the end of each message are not given at random but betray a coherent approach. John is following a (basic) salvation-historical line. Starting with paradise and ending with the exaltation of Christ, he highlights various points that seemed to him critical junctures in the biblical narrative. The relationship between God and mankind appears to have been at the fore of John's interest here. Starting with the paradisiacal setting of God walking with the first human couple (promise to Ephesus), he narrates subsequently the radical disturbance of this union (promise to Smyrna), its partial restoration through the tabernacle service (promise to Pergamum), the prophecy of an eschatological reign of the Messiah (promise to Thyatira), the almost failed endeavour of a new union at Sinai (promise to Sardis), the glorious but partial reconciliation of the temple (promise to Philadelphia) and finally the promised Messianic reign of the enthroned Jesus (promise to Laodicea).

The seer refers to these episodes in a fairly sequential way. However, chronologically speaking, one event is out of order; the Sinai theophany preceded Balaam's prophecy (according to Exodus and Numbers), but follows it in the sequence of promises given above. It is in this context that it is worth observing that Balaam's activity was in Jewish tradition not restricted to the episode in the plains of Moab. A number of texts situate him in Egypt (as an adviser to Pharaoh) before the Exodus even began<sup>(25)</sup>. Other texts relate that when the law was given to Israel, it was Balaam who explained to the nations what exactly happened<sup>(26)</sup>. While such relatively late rabbinic texts are by nature problematic evidence, they do witness to the development of Balaam from a more or less historical figure toward a mythical, archetypal, omnipresent personage, a development that had clearly been well on its way by the time of the writing of Rev 2,14; 2 Pet 2,15 and Jude 11. The notion that Balaam played an important role in Israelite history long before the Sinai theophany may account for the imprecision here. Apart from that, the sequence followed now fits much better the actual situation of the churches, which was, after all, John's principal concern. The church in Thyatira was far healthier than the one in Sardis. Thyatira is told "I know your works – your love, faith, service, and patient endurance. I know that your last works are greater than the first" (2,19), whereas Sardis has to

<sup>(25)</sup> Cf. e.g., b.Sot 11a; b.San 106a; ExodR 27,3 (on Exod 18,1).

<sup>(26)</sup> E.g. b.Zeb 116a.

hear: “I know your works; you have a name of being alive, but you are dead” (3,1). It would be rather awkward to give the compromising believers at Sardis the great messianic promise based on Balaam’s prediction, that they will have “authority over the nations” and give the exemplary believers at Thyatira the meagre assurance that their names will not be blotted out of the book of life.

The imprecision in chronology need not therefore bother us too much. Whatever one makes of the chronological exchange, the basic salvation-historical line of paradise – exodus – temple service – ministry of Jesus is very clear.

### *8. Conquering in the Remainder of Revelation*

As remarked above, νικάω keeps playing a significant role also after chapter 3. At major junctures in the battle between the Beast and the Lamb it occurs. We thus have the impression that whereas the series in chapter 3 ends with the exaltation of Jesus (the latest section of the biblical story in John’s days), the subsequent chapters narrate what “conquering” and “being conquered” will be done from that point onwards. The last occurrence of the verb νικάω in Revelation is in 21,7: “Those who conquer [ὁ νικῶν] will inherit these things, and I will be their God and they will be my children”. The similarity of form with the promises in chapters 2 and 3 is clear at once. This final promise, near the end of the book, takes up the theme inaugurated in the earlier chapters: the relationship between God and the conquering believers. This climactic promise surpasses the earlier ones; not only will the conquerors inherit the new Jerusalem, but they will also come into a relationship that excels even the paradisiacal relationship between God and men. They will be God’s own children.

Vrije Universiteit  
Faculty of Theology  
De Boeleaan 1105  
NL – 1081 HV Amsterdam

Matthijs DEN DULK

### SUMMARY

This article suggests that the promises to the “conquerors” at the close of each letter to the Asian churches in chapters 2 and 3 of the Apocalypse are based on subsequent events in salvation-history. The first promise (to the conquerors in Ephesus) refers to the creation story, the last promise (to the Laodicean conquerors) refers to the ministry and exaltation of Jesus. The promises to the other churches fit within this salvation-historical line from creation to the ministry of the Messiah, which is taken up again at the end of the book in the eschatological and climactic promise of Rev 21,7.

## A Note on the Two Endings of John

At last Fall's Society of Biblical Literature conference in Philadelphia, Jerome Neyrey argued that the traditional topics of encomium are employed in the Fourth Gospel's presentation of Jesus both from the perspective of outsiders (vituperation) and insiders (encomium)<sup>(1)</sup>. In a handout Neyrey listed the topics as (1) Geography and Generation, (2) Nurture and Training, (3) Accomplishments: Deeds of the Soul, (4) Comparison, and (5) Death and Posthumous honors, showing how each is employed in the description of insider and outsider understandings of the person of Jesus. For example, with regard to the topic of geography and generation, Jesus' opponents are described as claiming to know where Jesus is from (6,41-42; 7,27-29.41-42.52) and who his parents are (6,42), and in contrast to the insider view of Jesus' origins, both geographical (1,9; 3,13.31; 6,38.50-51) and familial (5,17.43; 10,25.30; 17,11.12.26). Neyrey's study, which shows the Fourth Evangelist's awareness of and conformity to canons of ancient rhetoric, is anticipated by another study from across that Atlantic that focuses strictly on comparison, Neyrey's fourth topic. The article, written by Christoph Müller, examines the Fourth Gospel's comparison of Jesus and John in the light of ancient rhetoricians' prescriptions regarding *synkrisis* and shows its conformity to the same<sup>(2)</sup>.

Neyrey's list of topics is derived from the rhetoricians' descriptions of encomium, and while no two of the theorists' lists of topics are identical, all more or less resemble Neyrey's distillation. Of those found in the extant Greek progymnasmata, Aphthonius's list is closest in form to Neyrey's. According to Aphthonius, the "headings" of encomium are: prooemion, origin ("which you will divide into nation, homeland, ancestors, and parents"; cf. topics 1 and 2 in Neyrey's list), upbringing, deeds, comparison, and epilogue (Aphthonius, 36).

<sup>(1)</sup> J.H. NEYREY, "What You See Is What You Get: Convention and Stereotype and Ancient Persons" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the SBL, Philadelphia, 19 November 2005). On encomium in the Gospels, see P.L. SHULER, *A Genre for the Gospels. The Biographical Character of Matthew* (Philadelphia 1982); ID., "The Synoptic Gospels and the Problem of Genre" (Ph.D. diss., McMaster University, 1975); ID., "The Genre(s) of the Gospels", *The Interrelations of the Gospels* (Leuven 1990) 459-83; cf. L. PERNOT, *La rhétorique de l'éloge dans le monde gréco-romain* (Paris 1993) I, 134-178.

<sup>(2)</sup> C.G. MÜLLER, "Der Zeuge und das Licht: Joh 1,1-4,3 und das Darstellungsprinzip der σύγκρισις", *Bib* 84 (2003) 479-509. On *synkrisis* in Luke, see J. ALETTI, *Quand Luc raconte. Le récit comme théologie* (Paris 1998) 69-112; F. O'FEARGHAIL, *The Introduction to Luke-Acts. A Study of the Role of Luke 1,1-4,44 in the Composition of Luke's Two-Volume Work* (AnBib 126; Rome 1991) 34; J.A. DARR, *On Character Building. The Reader and the Rhetoric of Characterization in Luke-Acts* (Louisville, KY 1992) 60-84; and C.G. MÜLLER, *Mehr als ein Prophet. Die Charakterzeichnung Johannes des Täufers im lukanischen Erzählwerk* (Herders Biblische Studien 31; Freiburg 2001) 49-152. For *synkrisis* in Hebrews, see A. VANHOYE, *La structure littéraire de l'épître aux Hébreux* (Paris-Bruges 1976) 144-151, 206-207; T.W. SEID, "Synkrisis in Hebrews 7: The Rhetorical Structure and Strategy", *Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture* (Sheffield 1999) 322-347.

It is the last heading listed by Aphthonius that draws our interest. Despite the resemblance of Neyrey's list to Aphthonius's, Neyrey does not look for an epilogue in the Fourth Gospel's presentation of Jesus, perhaps because Aphthonius is alone in describing epilogue as a topic or heading on par with geography, generation, etc.. A cursory examination of the Fourth Gospel's conclusion, however, in the light of Aphthonius's instruction reveals that not one, but two epilogues are nonetheless employed in the Fourth Gospel (lending further support to Neyrey's analysis). Both are, in fact, remarkably similar to the examples of epilogue seen at the end of Aphthonius's model encomia, invective, and comparison, employing the same "many other things . . . but/if" form as these:

Now Jesus did many other signs in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book. But these are written so that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that through believing you may have life in his name (John 20,30-31).

But there are also many other things that Jesus did; if every one of them were written down, I suppose that the world itself could not contain the books that would be written (John 21,25).

Many other things could be said about Thucydides, if the mass of his praises did not fall short of telling everything ("An Encomion of Thucydides"; Aphthonius, 38 [Kennedy]).

Many other things could be listed about wisdom, but it is impracticable to go into them all (from "An Encomion of Wisdom"; Aphthonius, 40 [Kennedy]).

When Philip was alive he know not when to stop, but the one who is describing him must stop somewhere ("An Invective against Philip"; Aphthonius, 42 [Kennedy]).

There are many other things that could be said about the virtue of both, if it were not that both had nearly equal fame from their deeds ("A Comparison of Achilles and Hector"; Aphthonius, 44 [Kennedy]).

Other *bioi*<sup>(3)</sup> too, close with what may be described as epilogues, including Philo's *De vita Mosis* and Josephus's *Vita*, the latter having been shown by Neyrey in another study<sup>(4)</sup>, to employ the traditional encomiastic topics in its overall structure:

Such, as recorded in the Holy Scriptures, was the life and such the end of Moses, king, lawgiver, high priest, prophet (Philo, *De vita Mosis*, 2,292 [Colson, LCL]).

Such are the events of my whole life; from them let others judge as they will of my character (Josephus, *Vita*, 430 [Thackeray, LCL]).

<sup>(3)</sup> On the Gospels, Philo's *De vita Mosis*, and Josephus's *Vita* as "*bioi*," see R.A. BURRIDGE, *What are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography* (Grand Rapids, MI 2004); cf. C.H. TALBERT, *What is a Gospel? The Genre of the Canonical Gospels* (Philadelphia 1977); ID., "Biographies of Philosophers and Rulers as Instruments of Religious Propaganda in Mediterranean Antiquity", *ANRW* 16.2,1619-1651; ID., "Once Again: Gospel Genre", *Semeia* 43 (1988) 53-73; ID., "Ancient Biography", *ABD* I, 745-749.

<sup>(4)</sup> J.H. NEYREY, "Josephus' *Vita* and the Encomium: A Native Model of Personality", *JSJ* 25 (1994) 177-206.

The obvious implication of the presence of these two Fourth Gospel epilogues is that we have, as Johannine scholars have long argued<sup>(5)</sup>, two conclusions to the Gospel, the original (which echoes in its claim that the Christ is Jesus the prologue [cf. 1,17] — or to use Aphthonius's term, the "prooemion"), and one that was added later. Hence rhetorical criticism offers new evidence for an old thesis.

Lubbock Christian University  
5601 19<sup>th</sup> Street  
Lubbock, TX; USA

Michael MARTIN

#### SUMMARY

This note argues that rhetorical canons supply new evidence for the thesis that the Fourth Gospel has two endings, the original (20,30-31) and one that was added later (21,25). Citing Neyrey's and Müller's studies of the Fourth Gospel's use of encomiastic topics in its description of Jesus, the note argues that the topic of epilogue (a topic not observed by either) is also employed in the Gospel and in conformity to Aphthonius's instruction. Indeed, the topic is employed not once, as expected, but twice, evidencing the presence of both an original conclusion and an amended one.

<sup>(5)</sup> See, e.g., R.E. BROWN, *The Gospel according to John* (AB 29a; Garden City, NY 1970) 1077-1082.

## Ein theologischer Ansatz zum Verständnis der Altarbaunotizen der Genesis

Bei ihrer Reise durch das fremde Land Kanaan erstaunt es, mit welcher Häufigkeit die Patriarchen Altäre und Gedenksteine aufrichten und Brunnen bauen. In vielen Fällen geben sie diesen Orten besondere Namen. Dieses Phänomen hat in der literarkritischen Forschung zu der bis heute weitverbreiteten These geführt, dass diese Erzählungen kultätiologischen Charakter haben, d.h., eine später genutzte Kultstätte im Nachhinein geschichtlich begründen sollen<sup>(1)</sup>. Wolfgang Zwickel untersucht zum ersten Mal alle alttestamentlichen Altarbaunotizen und kommt dabei bezüglich der Altäre zu dem Ergebnis, dass dieses Erklärungsmodell "einer mit den Altarbaunotizen verbundenen Kultgründung aufgegeben werden muß"<sup>(2)</sup>.

Um die Frage nach einer alternativen Erklärung zu beantworten, ist es sinnvoll, nicht nur die Altarbaunotizen, sondern die Vorkommen sämtlicher Gründungen und Benennungen durch die Patriarchen in ihrer Reihenfolge aufzulisten.

Beleg	Gründung	Gründer	Ort	Name	Theophanie	Opfer	Anrufung
12,7	Altar	Abraham	Sichem (More)	–	×		
12,8	Altar	Abraham	Zw. Bethel und Ai	–			×
(13,4) <sup>(3)</sup>	(Altar)	Abraham	Zw. Bethel und Ai	–			×
13,18	Altar	Abraham	Mamre	–	×		
(16,13f) <sup>(4)</sup>	(Brunnen)	Abraham	Zw. Kadesch und Bered	Beer-Lachai-Roi (Beerscheba)	×		×
21,30f	Brunnen	Abraham	Beerscheba				
21,33	Tamariske	Abraham	Beerscheba	–			×
22,9.14	Altar	Abraham	Morija	Jhwh-Jireh		×	
26,18	Brunnen <sup>(5)</sup>	Isaak					
26,19f	Brunnen	Isaak	Gerar	Esek			
26,21	Brunnen	Isaak	Gerar	Sitna			
26,22	Brunnen	Isaak	Gerar	Rechobot			
26,25	Altar	Isaak	Beerscheba	–	×		×
26,25	Brunnen	Isaak	Beerscheba	–			
26,32f	Brunnen	Isaak	Beerscheba	Schibea			

<sup>(1)</sup> Vgl. u.a. H.D. PREUSS, *Theologie des Alten Testaments* (Stuttgart 1991) I, 231.

<sup>(2)</sup> W. ZWICKEL, "Die Altarbaunotizen im Alten Testament", *Bib* 73 (1992) 545. In seiner Einzeluntersuchung meint er in fast allen Fällen zu erkennen, dass "mit dem Altarbau also nicht eine Kultstätte gegründet oder ein bereits bestehendes Heiligtum jahwisiert" wurde (538). Zwei kleine Kritikpunkte an seiner sonst überzeugenden historischen und theologischen Argumentation seien an dieser Stelle genannt. Die Aussage, dass es zwischen Bethel und Ai nie ein Heiligtum gegeben habe (537), lässt sich alleine durch das *argumentum ex silentio* nicht begründen, dass man ein solches bislang nicht nachweisen konnte (536, Fn. 14). Die Nennung von Terebinthen (Gen 12,6f.; Ri 6,19.24) kann nicht als Beweis einer bereits existierenden Kultstätte gelten (so 537), da es kaum vorstellbar ist, dass mit jedem Baum dieser Gattung ein Kult verbunden war.

<sup>(3)</sup> Abraham kehrt aus Ägypten zu dem Altar zurück.

<sup>(4)</sup> Hagar begegnet Gott an einem bereits bestehenden Brunnen.

<sup>(5)</sup> Isaak gräbt die Wasserbrunnen seines Vaters wieder auf und gibt ihnen ihre alten Namen.

Beleg	Gründung	Gründer	Ort	Name	Theophanie	Opfer	Anrufung
28,18-22 (31,13)	Gedenkstein	Jakob	Lus	Bethel	×	( <sup>6</sup> )	( <sup>7</sup> )
31,45f	Gedenkstein	Jakob	Mizpa	Gal-Ed			
32,3	(Ort)	Jakob	—	Mahanajim	×		
32,31	(Ort)	Jakob	Am Jabbok	Peniel	×		
33,14	(Ort)	Jakob	Sukkot	Sukkot			
33,20	Altar	Jakob	Sichem	El-Elohe-Jisrael			
35,7	Altar	Jakob	Lus	El-Bethel			
35,8	(Eiche)( <sup>8</sup> )	Jakob	Bei Bethel	Allon Bachut			
35,14f (35,1.3)	Gedenkstein	Jakob	Bethel	Bethel	×	( <sup>9</sup> )	
35,20( <sup>10</sup> )	Gedenkstein	Jakob	Bethlehem	—			

Johann Marböck weist für den Jakobszyklus nach, wie sich die Erzählungen von den “heiligen Orten” in die literarische Struktur der Genesis einfügen. So zeigt er, dass die beiden Altarbaunotizen in Gen 12,7 und 22,9 nicht zufällig im äußeren Rahmen der Toledot Terachs stehen. Die erste Notiz bildet Abrahams dankbare Antwort auf die Verheißung Gottes, seinen Nachkommen das Land zu geben. Der letzte Altarbau ist “Zeichen der Bereitschaft, den Sohn der Verheißung an den geheimnisvoll fordernden Gott (*h’lthym*) wieder zurückzugeben”(<sup>11</sup>). Der erste Altar drückt Abrahams Antwort aus, der letzte Altar wird durch seinen Namen zum Zeichen für Gottes Antwort.

Ähnlich wie der Altar zwischen Ai und Bethel am Anfang und Ende der Reise Abrahams in den Süden und nach Ägypten steht (Gen 12,8; 13,4), so rahmen die Gedenksteine in Bethel die Reise Jakobs nach Haran (28,18-22; 35,14f.; vgl. 35,1.3). Die Gottesbegegnungen von Bethel, Mahanajim und Peniel bilden die “Eckpfeiler” der Toledot Isaaks, wobei die Engel Elohims von Gen 32,3 auf Gen 28,12 zurückverweisen(<sup>12</sup>).

Wird das Modell einer kultätiologischen Deutung abgelehnt, stellt sich nun erneut die Frage nach dem Zweck der auffallend häufig berichteten Gründungen heiliger Orte. Den entscheidenden Hinweis auf den in der Erzählstrategie der Texte selbst verfolgten Zweck bieten ohne Zweifel die Namensgebungen. Namen wie *Beer-Lachai-Roi* (Gen 16,14)(<sup>13</sup>), *Jhwh-Jireh* (22,14)(<sup>14</sup>), *Rechobot*

(<sup>6</sup>) Jakob gießt Öl auf die Spitze des Steines.

(<sup>7</sup>) Jakob legt ein Gelübde ab.

(<sup>8</sup>) Jakob benennt die Eiche, unter der die Amme Rebekkas begraben wird.

(<sup>9</sup>) Jakob spendet ein *Trankopfer* mit Öl.

(<sup>10</sup>) Jakob richtet einen Gedenkstein über dem *Grab* von Rahel auf.

(<sup>11</sup>) J. MARBÖCK, “Heilige Orte im Jakobszyklus. Einige Beobachtungen und Aspekte”, *Die Väter Israels. Beiträge zur Theologie der Patriarchenüberlieferungen im Alten Testament* (Hrsg. M. GÖRG) (Stuttgart 1989) 214.

(<sup>12</sup>) A. a. O. 220.

(<sup>13</sup>) Der Ortsname lässt sich philologisch nicht sicher deuten. Vgl. H. SEEBASS, *Genesis* (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1997) II/1, 90 und C. WESTERMANN, *Genesis* (BKAT I/2; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1981) 297. Doch die im Text gegebene Etymologie spricht das Bekenntnis aus *אלהים אתה אל* *Du bist ein Gott der Erscheinung* (Gen 22,13).

(<sup>14</sup>) WESTERMANN, *Genesis*, 444 bezeichnet diesen Namen *Gott sieht* als “Gotteslob”. Analog zum Altarnamen *יהוה שלום Jhwh Schalom* (Ri 6,24) spricht aber dennoch nichts dagegen, dass es sich hier um den Namen eines wirklichen Ortes handelt, der vielleicht gegenüber von Edom liegt, drei Tagesreisen von Beerscheba entfernt, vgl. SEEBASS, *Genesis*, II/1, 211f.



(26,22)<sup>(15)</sup>, מַחֲנַיִם *Machanajim* (Gen 32,3)<sup>(16)</sup>, פְּנִיֵּאל *Peniel* (Gen 32,31)<sup>(17)</sup>, אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל *El-Elohe-Jisrael* (33,20)<sup>(18)</sup> und בֵּית־אֵל *El-Bethel* (Gen 35,7)<sup>(19)</sup> weisen deutlich auf den Gott der Namensgeber hin. Nach dem Selbstverständnis der Texte möchten die Gründer heiliger Orte die Aufmerksamkeit ihrer Zeitgenossen auf ihren Gott lenken. Dies führt bereits Zwickel zu der Feststellung:

Mit der Namensbelegung soll Jahwes Wundertat gerühmt werden. . . . Der Altarbau ist gleichzeitig Bekenntnis zu Jahwe und Zeichen der Frömmigkeit des Erbauers. Mit der Stiftung eines Altars an der Kultstätte seiner Gottheit dankt er ihr für die Bewahrung in Notsituationen etc. . . . [Die Altäre] wurden gerne nach besonderen Gotteserlebnissen als spontanes Zeugnis der Dankbarkeit und zum Ruhm der verehrten Gottheit errichtet<sup>(20)</sup>.

Ein Großteil<sup>(21)</sup> der in den Patriarchenerzählungen aufgezählten Gründungen und Benennungen ist also ein Hinweis sowohl auf die Frömmigkeit der Gründer als auch ein "Zeugnis" für alle, die es sehen bzw. davon hören.

<sup>(15)</sup> רְחֹבוֹת *Rechobot* bedeutet *weite Räume*. Auch dieser Ortsname ist ein „Lobname“, so WESTERMANN, *Genesis*, 521. Der Text gibt die Erklärung: "Jetzt hat (den Raum) weit gemacht Jhwh für uns und wir werden fruchtbar sein im Land". Der Nachsatz zeigt, dass der Name Vertrauen in die Verheißung Gottes (Gen 17,6.20) ausdrückt.

<sup>(16)</sup> Die etymologische Herleitung des Namens מַחֲנַיִם *Machanajim* im Text durch מַחֲנֵה אֱלֹהִים *Heerlager Gottes ist dies* lässt die Frage nach dem Dual des Ortsnamens offen. Möglicherweise ist es ein Hinweis auf Jakobs und Gottes Lager, vgl. V.P. HAMILTON, *The Book of Genesis*. Chapters 1–17 (NICOT; Grand Rapids 1995) 317. H. SEEBASS, *Genesis* (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1999) II/2, 378 identifiziert den Ort mit *Tell el-Heggag*, ca. 3 km südlich des Jabbok.

<sup>(17)</sup> פְּנִיֵּאל *Peniel*, *Gesicht von El* wird in Gen 32,31 wohl deshalb mit ׀ *jod* statt wie üblich mit ׀ *waw* (V.31 im samaritanischen Pentateuch; V.32; Ri 8,8f.17; 1.Kö 12,25) geschrieben, um die Ähnlichkeit zu פְּנִים *Gesichter* herauszustellen, so WESTERMANN, *Genesis*, 633. Der Ortsname ist ein Zeugnis für die Erfahrung: "Ich sah Elohim von Angesicht zu Angesicht und gerettet wurde meine Seele" (Gen 32,31). Der Anschluss des zweiten Teilsatzes mit *Ip̄f. cons.* (und nicht ׀ *aber* mit Substantiv) deutet darauf hin, dass es nicht um eine Rettung trotz des Sehens Gottes geht (vgl. Ex 33,20; Jes 6,5). Der Satz wird gewöhnlich auf V.12 bezogen (dort auch נִצַּל), wo Jakob um Rettung vor seinem Bruder bittet. Durch seine Gottesbegegnung bekommt Jakob Gewissheit der Rettung, nach Ehrfurcht fühlt er Erleichterung. So wird die mit dem Ort verbundene Namensgebung zu einem "stamenent of testimony", einer zeugnishaften Aussage, so HAMILTON, *Genesis*, 337.

<sup>(18)</sup> Der Name dieses Altars sagt aus, dass El Israels Gott ist, nicht dass der Kult des Gottes Israels an die Stelle des El-Kultes tritt, so SEEBASS, *Genesis*, II/2, 415 gegen WESTERMANN, *Genesis*, 645. Mit diesem öffentlichen Bekenntnis löst Jakob seinen Eid ein (Gen 28,21, dort allerdings mit "Jhwh"), den Schöpfergott zu seinem Gott zu machen, vgl. G. WENHAM, *Genesis 16–50* (WBC 2; Waco 1994) 301.

<sup>(19)</sup> Die Benennung des Altars in Bethel mit dem Gottesnamen *El-Bethel* stellt eine Ausrufung des Gottes El-Bethel dar, so SEEBASS, *Genesis* II/2, 438. WENHAM, *Genesis* 16–50, 325 verweist auf eine assyrische Parallele *Illu-bayt-ilī*, weshalb man an dieser Stelle nicht mit den Versionen zu *Bethel* vereinfachen sollte.

<sup>(20)</sup> ZWICKEL, "Altarbaunotizen", 537f.

<sup>(21)</sup> Zu den säkularen Zeichen gehören die Brunnen *Beerscheba*, *Esek*, *Sitna*, *Schibea* (Gen 26,20f.25.33), die ein Verhältnis zu Abimelech von Gerar ausdrücken und der Gedenkstein *Gal-Ed* (31,45), der ein Verhältnis zu Laban ausdrückt. Ferner der Name *Sukkot* (33,14), die Eiche *Allon Bauchut* (35,8) und der Gedenkstein in Bethlehem (35,20), die beiden letzten für eine Verstorbene.

Am Ende seiner Untersuchung der Altarbaunotizen zeigt sich Zwickel erstaunt darüber, „daß sich die Liste der Altarerbauer fast wie eine Kurzfassung der alttestamentlichen Geschichte liest. Keine entscheidende Person der Heilsgeschichte nach der Sintflut fehlt“<sup>(22)</sup>. Er erwägt eine literarkritische Erklärung, nach der auf einer späten redaktionellen Stufe Altarbaunotizen als Zeichen der Frömmigkeit des betreffenden Menschen hinzugefügt worden sind. Doch lässt sich dem eine theologische Erklärung entgegenstellen.

Auffällig ist hier zunächst einmal, dass die Altäre häufig an Wohnorten von Bundesgenossen der Patriarchen errichtet werden. Abraham baut einen Altar bei Hebron, wo Mamre wohnt (Gen 13,18) und pflanzt eine Tamariske bei Abimelech in Gerar, verbunden mit einer Anrufung Jhwhs (21,33). Auch Isaak ruft dort den Namen Jhwhs an und baut einen Altar (26,25).

Zum zweiten beeindruckt die Vorstellung der praktischen Umstände eines Altarbaus. Die Errichtung eines Altars ist mit einem erheblichen Kraftaufwand verbunden<sup>(23)</sup>. Die häufig damit verbundene Anrufung des Namens Jhwhs (Gen 12,8; 13,4; 26,25; vgl. 21,33) begleitet die Tat mit Worten. Dieses Zeugnis kann von den Ansässigen kaum übersehen werden.

Auch die Rauchsäule des auf dem Altar dargebrachten Opfers wird weithin sichtbar gewesen sein<sup>(24)</sup>. Diese symbolisiert die Verbindung zwischen Himmel und Erde und gemeinsam mit dem Feuer die Anwesenheit Gottes<sup>(25)</sup>. Die Ähnlichkeit zu der Opferpraxis der damaligen Umwelt wird zur Verständlichkeit der Riten für beobachtende Zeugen beigetragen haben<sup>(26)</sup>.

Im Kontext der unter dem Vorzeichen der Segensverheißung stehenden Patriarchenerzählung lässt sich hinter diesem Zeugnischarakter nun eine wesentliche theologische Dimension erkennen. Der Bau bleibender Denkmäler als Hinweise auf den Gott der Patriarchen lässt sich als Teil ihrer Sendung verstehen.

Für das Beispiel der Pflanzung einer Tamariske in Gen 21,33 weist Robert Hayward in der jüdischen Auslegung seit dem 1.Jh n.Chr. ein solches Verständnis nach. Abraham lebt in Beerscheba, einem Ort, der von vielen Reisenden nach Kanaan frequentiert wird. Den aramäischen Targumen

<sup>(22)</sup> A. a. O. 545. Er nennt Noah als zentrale Gestalt der Urgeschichte, die Erzväter, Mose, Aaron, Bileam, Josua, Gideon als bedeutende Richter, Elia als Prophet, Samuel, die ersten drei Könige Saul, David und Salomo, spätere Könige wie Jerobeam, Asa, Ahab, Ahas und Manasse, aus nachexilischer Zeit Josua und Serubbabel.

<sup>(23)</sup> A. a. O. 535.

<sup>(24)</sup> Zwar wird nur in Gen 22,13 explizit von einem *עֹלֶה* *Brandopfer* auf dem Altar geredet. An anderen Stellen wird es jedoch möglicherweise als selbstverständlich vorausgesetzt. So mag es für den Schreiber sinnvoller gewesen sein, das bleibende Denkmal des Altars zu erwähnen, als den möglicherweise nur einmaligen Vorgang des Opfers. Vgl. G. WENHAM, *Genesis 1–15* (WBC 1; Waco 1987) 280. Es ist sinnvoller, aus dem direkten Kontext der Erzählung eine Schlachtopferpraxis anzunehmen, als archäologische Funde aus der späten Bronzezeit heranzuziehen, um die Altäre als Depositflächen für Opfergaben zu interpretieren, so ZWICKEL, „Altarbaunotizen“, 538.

<sup>(25)</sup> C. EBERHARD, *Studien zur Bedeutung des Opfers im Alten Testament*. Die Signifikanz von Blut- und Verbrennungsrieten im kultischen Rahmen (WMANT 94; Neukirchen-Vluyn 2002) 361–364.

<sup>(26)</sup> Vgl. a. a. O. 359, Fn. 1.

zufolge informiert Abraham dort Fremde über den Gott Israels. Der Targum *Pseudo-Jonathan* stellt Abraham als einen Prediger dar, der die Menschen zum Glauben an den Gott der Juden ruft. Abraham ist in der frühjüdischen Tradition nicht nur ein passives Glaubensvorbild, sondern ein aktiver Verkündiger des Gottes aller Menschen<sup>(27)</sup>.

Die Hypothese Zwickels, dass jede bedeutende Person nachsintflutlicher Heilsgeschichte nachträglich zu einem Altarbauer gemacht worden ist, lässt sich auf diesem theologischen Hintergrund nun geradezu umkehren. Nicht die bedeutenden Personen der Heilsgeschichte werden (durch Redaktionsprozesse) zu Altarbauern, sondern die Altarbauer werden zu den entscheidenden Personen der Heilsgeschichte. Sie erhalten ihre Bedeutung im Rahmen des biblischen Geschichtsverständnisses von daher, dass sie den zeugnishaften Aspekt ihrer Sendung zum Segen nicht vernachlässigen. Als Gesegnete Jhwhs gehen sie ihrer Sendung als Segensmittler Jahwes auf dem Weg der Gründung heiliger Orte nach. Sie errichten diese Stätten dabei nicht, um ihre eigene Frömmigkeit vor aller Öffentlichkeit zu demonstrieren<sup>(28)</sup>, sondern um ein Zeugnis für ihren Gott abzulegen. Somit ist der Altarbau nicht nur in der Vätererzählung, sondern auch darüber hinaus zentraler Bestandteil der Umsetzung der Segensverheißung aus Gen 12,3.

Nelkenweg 6  
75238 Schömberg  
Deutschland

Siegbert RIECKER

#### SUMMARY

This article is thought to be an interaction with the interesting and innovative contribution of Wolfgang Zwickel in *Biblica* 73 (1992). He disagreed with the cult aetiology hypothesis for the "Altarbaunotizen" of the Old Testament. His argumentation was convincing, but his alternative explanation seemed to be comparatively weak. The present contribution tries to give another explanation for the phenomenon of the "Altarbaunotizen". They can be connected indirectly with the blessing promise of Gen 12,3 and therefore to the whole theological thrust of the book of Genesis. The offerings can be interpreted as witness to the Canaanite population. Even though this thought seems to be quite uncommon, many hints can be found in the texts, that point into this direction, supported by a late Jewish interpretation of Gen 21,33.

<sup>(27)</sup> R. HAYWARD, "Abraham as Proselytizer at Beer-Sheba in the Targums of the Pentateuch", *JJS* 49 (1998) 36f. Vgl. H. KOOREVAAR, *Priestercanon*. Genesis, Exodus – Leviticus – Numeri, Deuteronomium, Jozua, Rechters, Samuël, Koningen (Heverlee 2005) 39, Fn. 41.

<sup>(28)</sup> Diese Praxis, durch die Stiftung von Altären seine Frömmigkeit *coram publico* unter Beweis zu stellen, kommt nach ZWICKEL, "Altarbaunotizen", 544f. spätestens im 8. Jh auf, ist jedoch offensichtlich eine sehr fragwürdige Motivation zum Bau.

## Haggai: Structure and Meaning

### 1. *The Structure*

In a study of a biblical text, the scholar often faces the problem whether the work in question constitutes a collection of individual units or one literary whole. This question is all the more pertinent in small books such as Haggai. This article will deal not with the question of the book's authorship, or its redaction and creation<sup>(1)</sup>, but rather with its literary aspect: whether the book is an anthology of prophetic sayings or one unified work.

An effective way of dealing with such questions is to discover the structure of a work, in which each oracle plays a role in the whole. Haggai contains four units<sup>(2)</sup>:

- 1,1-16: The prophet's call to build the Temple (vv. 1-11.13), the people's response (vv. 12.14-15)<sup>(3)</sup>
- 2,1-9: Encouragement of the people in relation to God's presence and the future glory of the Temple.
- 2,10-19: Against the participation of the Samaritans in building the Temple
- 2,20-23: Oracle on Zerubbabel's future status

The four oracles are ordered chronologically, according to the date at the beginning of each one<sup>(4)</sup>. This chronological order perhaps explains why scholars did not make any great effort to examine other principles of structure<sup>(5)</sup>. In this article, I wish to show the principle behind the arrangement of the oracles and its significance for an understanding of the meaning of the book.

### 2. *Division of the book into two parts*

The contents of the oracles and the formal formulae delimit the division of the oracles into two parts. The first two oracles are closely interrelated

<sup>(1)</sup> For a survey of opinions regarding the literary development of the Book see J. KESSLER, *The Book of Haggai*. Prophecy and Society in Early Persian Yehud (SVT, 91, Leiden 2002) 31-57.

<sup>(2)</sup> This division of the Book in its present form is held by many: see e.g.: H.G. MITCHELL, *Haggai* (ICC, Edinburgh 1912) 27. Some scholars separate 1,13-15a from what precedes it, and find in the Book five units, see e.g.: P.A. VERHOEF, *The Books of Haggai and Malachi* (NICOT, Grand Rapids 1989) 20-25; Other find three: B. PECKHAM, *History and Prophecy*. The Development of Late Judean Literary Traditions (New York 1993) 741.

<sup>(3)</sup> I adopt here the division according to which 1,1-15 is regarded as one unit, that is subdivided into two parts, the first (vv. 1-11) consisting of the prophet's instruction to build the temple, while the second (vv. 12-15) is the positive response of the people, which includes another oracle in v. 13. Similarly: KESSLER, *The Book of Haggai*, 247.

<sup>(4)</sup> P.A. VERHOEF, "Notes on the Dates in the Book of Haggai", *Text and Context*. Old Testament and Semitic Studies for F.C. Fensham (ed. W. CLAASSEN) (JSOTSS, 48, Sheffield 1988) 259-267 has proposed that the purpose and significance of the dates in Haggai are to state the authenticity and validity of the prophetic message.

thematically. In the first oracle, the prophet urges the people to build the Temple, and in the second, uttered two months later, he comforts those who are disappointed by the unpretentious and modest construction that they see.

The third and the fourth oracles were uttered on the same day and are presented as a continuity, as indicated in the opening to the fourth oracle: "The word of the LORD came a second time to Haggai" (2,20). There is a thematic connection also between these two oracles. Both deal with questions of status and identity. The third oracle discusses the question of who belongs to Israel. The people think that the Samaritans can be part of Israel and can help them to build the Temple. Haggai, however, calls the Samaritans "an unclean nation" and opposes any intermingling with them (2,14)<sup>(6)</sup>. The question of Israel's status and identity appears here in all its gravity. The fourth oracle likewise deals with the question of status and identity: the status of Zerubbabel, scion of the House of David (1 Chron. 3,17-19)<sup>(7)</sup>. The return to Zion had commenced, but Judah was not independent politically, and the status of King David's offspring was inferior. This situation affected Judah's status among the peoples, and therefore Haggai prophesied that Zerubbabel's status would rise while the status of the kingdoms of the nations will decline (2,22)<sup>(8)</sup>.

The style of the opening and closing of the oracles confirms the division of the book into two parts. While a full date is given in the first (1,1) and the third oracles (2,10), with indication of year, month and day, the date in the second (2,1) and the fourth oracles (2,20) is incomplete: in the second, the month and the day, and in the fourth the day only<sup>(9)</sup>. The most convincing explanation for the different types of dates is their function in the book. It would seem that indication of the full date is designed to mark the beginning of a new part, whereas the use of an incomplete date in the second and the fourth oracles is designed to indicate the start of a new oracle within the

<sup>(5)</sup> A chiasmic structure to the Book was suggested by: M.H. FLOYD, *Minor Prophets* (Part II, FOTL, Grand Rapids – Cambridge 2000) 257-258. I do not believe that this structure has been adequately proved. On the structure of Haggai see: C.L. MEYERS – E.M. MEYERS, *Haggai, Zechariah 1–8* (AB, New York 1987) xlvii-xlviii; J.G. BALDWIN, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi* (Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries, London 1972) 31; PECKHAM, *History and Prophecy*, 741-748; T. CHARY, *Aggée, Zacharie, Malachie* (Sources bibliques, Paris 1969) 12-13; C. STUHLMEYER, *Haggai and Zechariah. Rebuilding with Hope* (ITC, Grand Rapids 1998) 15; KESSLER, *The Book of Haggai*, 247-251. For a form-critical analysis see: K. KOCH, "Haggais unreines Volk", ZAW 79 (1967) 52-66.

<sup>(6)</sup> I follow here the suggestion proposed by Rothstein that this prophecy is against the Samaritans (although I think that 2,10-19 is one unit). J.W. ROTHSTEIN, *Juden und Samaritaner. Die grundlegende Scheidung von Judentum und Heidentum. Eine kritische Studie zum Buche Haggai und zur jüdische Geschichte im ersten nachexilischen Jahrhundert* (BWANT 3, Leipzig 1908) 5-41. Today, many disagree with Rothstein's hypothesis: see e.g. KOCH, "Haggais unreines Volk", 52-66.

<sup>(7)</sup> Even though it is striking that Haggai makes no reference to Zerubbabel as royal, see: A. LEMAIRE, "Zorobabel et la Judée à la lumière de l'épigraphie (fin du VI<sup>e</sup> s. av. J.-C.)", RB 103 (1996) 54-55.

<sup>(8)</sup> See P.R. BEDFORD, "Discerning the Time: Haggai, Zechariah and the 'Delay' in the Rebuilding of the Jerusalem Temple", *The Pitcher is Broken. Memorial Essays for Gösta W. Ahlström* (eds. S.W. HOLLOWAY – L.K. HANDY) (JSOTSS 190, Sheffield 1995) 84.

<sup>(9)</sup> Various explanations were offered for the different forms of the dates: see: R. YARON, "The Schema of the Aramaic Legal Documents", JJS 2 (1957) 33-61, 60-61; KESSLER, *The Book of Haggai*, 44-48.

part<sup>(10)</sup>. This division is also supported by the fact that the concluding formula “says the LORD of hosts” ends the second and the fourth oracles only; in the first and the third there is no closing formula.

These findings establish the division of the four oracles into two parts: at the beginning of the first part there is a full date indicating the start of the two oracles that end with the closing “says the LORD of hosts” at the end of the second oracle. The third oracle starts again with a full date to indicate the start of a new part, and the fourth oracle ends with the formula “says the LORD of hosts” as in the conclusion of the first part.

After establishing the two parts of the book, each made up of two oracles, we find that there is a close connection between the first elements of the two parts, i.e. the first and the third oracles, and between the second elements in each part, i.e. the second and the fourth oracles<sup>(11)</sup>.

### 3. *The First and the Third Oracles*

In both these oracles the prophet makes allegations against “this people” (1,2; 2,14). This expression does not appear in the other two oracles<sup>(12)</sup>.

In both oracles the situation depicted is of economic distress, which is described similarly. The two oracles present two different aspects of the economic distress. Severe natural disasters cause extensive damage to the agricultural produce. The first oracle speaks of drought, 1,10-11, and in third the disasters are blight, mildew and hail: 2,17.19.

In both oracles there is an additional economic difficulty: the people work hard but for little yield, 1,6; 2,15. Both descriptions relate also to an emotional disappointment in light of the small crop as against the high expectations.

In both oracles the explanation of the difficult economic situation is the destruction of the Temple, and the people’s failure to rebuild it, and in both the prophet maintains that with the construction of the Temple the economic problem will be solved, 1,4.8-11. In the third oracle the prophet declares that on the day of laying of the Temple’s foundation, the economic problem will improve, 2,18-19.

In both oracles Haggai demands that the people consider their actions well and mend their ways. Both use the expression: שִׁמוּ לִבְכֶּם עַל דְּרֹכֵיכֶם (1,5, 7) שִׁמוּ נָא לִבְכֶּם (2,15,18). This expression with its variations appears in the

<sup>(10)</sup> Many scholars think that 15b is actually the introduction to 2:1-9, see e.g.: BHS; MITCHELL, *Haggai*, 58; H.W. WOLFF, *Haggai. A Commentary* (Minneapolis 1988) 59; Verhoef proposed that this verse functions in a double role, it concludes the preceding oracle, but also is part of the introduction to the next one. See: VERHOEF, “Notes on the Dates in the Book of Haggai”, 262. However, the structure of the Book proves that indeed it is intentional that the first and third oracles only have a full date, while the second and the fourth have a short version of the date.

<sup>(11)</sup> See also: B. CHILDS, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (Philadelphia 1979) 469-470; KESSLER, *The Book of Haggai*, 250-251, who both speak of a ABAB structure.

<sup>(12)</sup> Townsend has noticed some of the connections between 1,1-11 and 2,10-19, and demonstrated a similar structure of these oracles. See: T.N. TOWNSEND, “Additional Comments on Haggai II 10-19”, *VT* 18 (1968) 559-560. Some have noticed a few connections between the first oracle and 2,15-19. But this was used to sustain the opinion that the later unit should be replaced after 1,15a. See Wolff, *Haggai*, 60.

book in these two oracles only, and both in the context of the economic distress<sup>(13)</sup>.

The dates in these oracles are given in full, that is, day, month and year. However, the order of year, month, day in the first oracle is reversed in the third oracle. This reversal at the beginning of the second part shows an intention of creating an additional connection between the two oracles according to Zaidel's discovery that when a biblical source cites another, such source frequently reverses the order of their components<sup>(14)</sup>.

#### 4. *The Second and Fourth Oracles*

In the second oracle, the problem is the status of the newly built Temple. After the laying of the foundations, it became clear that it did not correspond to the standards of the First Temple. The people's response was to look down on the Second Temple, 2,3. The fourth oracle also deals with the problem of a lower status, that of Zerubbabel, scion of the House of David (2,21-23). The correlation between the status of the Temple and that of the king appears also in the account of David's initiative to build the Temple after building his palace (2 Sam 7,2)<sup>(15)</sup>.

In both oracles the awaited transition will occur in the future in the framework of cataclysmic upheavals and changes, which will include political transformations and disruption of natural forces. These descriptions are similar in both oracles. In both, following the upheavals in natural forces (2,6; 2,21), worldwide cataclysmic upheaval will occur (2,7; 2,22). In the framework of these changes the Temple will be filled with glory according to the second oracle, 2,7.9; and Zerubbabel's status will rise according to the fourth oracle, 2,23.

I indicated above that the similar closing of the second and fourth oracles supports the division of the book into two. The relation between the endings of these two oracles is not limited to their ending צבאות נאם ה'; the rhetorical structure of both verses is also similar.

Hag 2,9:

- (1) גדול יהיה כבוד הבית הזה האחרון מן הראשון
- (2) אמר יהוה צבאות
- (3) ובמקום הזה אתן שלום
- (4) נאם יהוה צבאות

The structure of the verse is alternate; the elements marked with uneven numbers are the actual contents of the message, whereas the elements marked with even numbers function syntactically as a parenthetical clause, that God is the source of the message.

<sup>(13)</sup> The term שים לב appears in Deut. 32,45, and also in Isa. 41,22; Ezek. 40,4; 44,5. However, the full term שמו לבכם על דרכים is unique to Haggai (also in 1,7; in 2,15,18 the shorter term is found).

<sup>(14)</sup> M. ZAIDEL, "מקבילות בין ספר ישעיה לספר תהלים", *Sinai* 38 (1957) 149-172, 229-242, 272-290, 333-355 (Hebrew); G. BRIN – Y. HOFFMAN, "לשימוש הכיאסמוס במקרא", *Sefer Zaidel* (eds. E. Elinor et. al.) (Jerusalem 1962) 280-289.

<sup>(15)</sup> BEDFORD, "Discerning the Time", 94. For the position of royalty in the rebuilding of the Temple see: D.L. PETERSEN, "Zerubbabel and Jerusalem Temple Reconstruction", *CBQ* 36 (1974) 366-372.



The closing words of the fourth oracle (2,23) have a similar structure:

- (1) ביום ההוא
- (2) נאם יְהוָה צבאות
- (3) אֶקְחָךְ וְרִבְבֵּל בֶּן־שָׁאִלְיָאֵל עִבְדִּי
- (4) נאם יְהוָה
- (5) וְשִׁמְתִּיךְ כְּחֹתָם כִּי־בָךְ בַּחֲרֹתִי
- (6) נאם יְהוָה צבאות

The closing verse of the fourth oracle also has an alternating structure, between the contents of the messages and parenthetical clauses indicating that God is the source of the message. The elements of the uneven lines constitute the actual message, and each such part of a sentence is followed by the parenthetical clause of the divine source (indicated by even numbers). The structure of both verses is similar, except that at the close of the second there is a double alternation, whereas a tripe alternation appears at the close of the fourth oracle.

In both oracles the closing verse constitutes the climax. In the second, the closing verse declares that the future glory of the Second Temple will be greater than the glory of the First. The closing of the fourth oracle constitutes the goal of the oracle which anticipates the elevation of the status of Zerubbabel, descendant of King David and God's chosen one. This structure of a message interrupted by parenthetical clauses is designed to dramatise the contents of the message. The triple alternating structure in the fourth oracle creates an even greater dramatic effect. The dramatic fragmentation of the message by recurring expressions of the divine source of the message reinforces God's status as originator of these changes.

To sum up, the four oracles of the book are divided into two; the first two constitute the first part of the book, and the last two the second part. Connections were found between the first two oracles of each part, and between the second two oracles in each part. This structure shows that the book is not a random collection of oracles arranged in chronological order, but that it is one unified literary work. Moreover, the linguistic connections indicate that the structure and wording of the oracles belong to the same stratum<sup>(16)</sup>.

## 5. The Meaning

Why were the oracles formulated in this elaborate structure? How does the structure contribute to an understanding of the meaning of the book as a whole? Generally, scholars consider that Haggai deals principally with the question of how to motivate the people to rebuild the devastated temple in the ruined Jerusalem<sup>(17)</sup>. Indeed, this is the main theme running through most of the material in the book, and this is the role attributed to Haggai in Ezra 5,1-2.

<sup>(16)</sup> In light of this elaborated structure, any attempt to rearrange the order of the oracles should be rejected. I refer here especially to the proposal that 2,15-19 should follow the date in 1,15a, see e.g.: ROTHSTEIN, *Juden und Samaritaner*, 53-73.

<sup>(17)</sup> See e.g.: MITCHELL, *Haggai*, 36-37.

To apprehend the implications of the structure of the book in order to understand its meaning it is necessary to define the genre of each oracle and characterise them. The first oracle is an oracle of admonition. Haggai admonishes the people who instead of rebuilding of the Temple took care of their own needs (1,4.9); he demands that they consider their actions and mend their ways (1,5.7). The second oracle is an oracle of consolation. The prophet comforts the people, who are disappointed by the appearance of the Temple, explaining that the glory of the Second Temple will eventually exceed that of the First Temple (2,9).

In the second part of the book there is also a similar structure in the third and fourth oracles. The third oracle is again an oracle of admonition. Haggai admonishes the people on their intention or wish to intermingle with the Samaritans. He decisively declares that the Samaritans are unclean, and that if Judah mingle with them, they will also be unclean, and their participation in building of the Temple will make the Temple unclean (2,14). In this oracle, the prophet again demands that the people consider their ways (2,15.18). The fourth oracle is an oracle of consolation. Haggai prophesies that in the future Zerubbabel will be raised from his inferior status, and will be recognised as God's chosen one (2,23).

Two further significant distinctions must be added. The first oracle deals with an existential religious problem. Building the Temple is a religious action, but it also solves the existential problems of economic distress. The third oracle also deals with an existential religious problem. The people apparently expected that the participation of the Samaritans in the building of the Temple will ease the economic stress, Haggai argues that the economic problems will only be solved as soon as the foundations of the Temple are laid. In both oracles, the prophet confronts the people with a practical claim.

The second and the fourth oracles are to be classified as cognitive religious oracles. In both oracles, the prophet does not ask the people to do or not to do something; but he deals with the people's consciousness, he asks the people to change their perception. In the second oracle, he expects the people not to disparage the Temple, and in the fourth, he announces Zerubbabel's future greatness.

Another point must also be made. In the first and third oracles the prophet demands that the people act immediately, and the positive effects of these actions will be seen in the immediate future. Conversely, in the second and the fourth oracles he does not demand any action from the people. Here the action demanded is from God. However, the time of fulfilment of the oracles and the date of God's action is shrouded in mystery. This is a future that cannot be foreseen, a future beyond the horizon<sup>(18)</sup>. This is a future reality of cataclysmic changes.

Structurally, there is a progression between the two oracles in each of the two parts of the book, from admonition to consolation. I believe that the idea latent in this structure concerns the serious religious and existential problems with which the people in Judah contended at the beginning of the return from exile. There is one recurring motif in all prophecies of the Book: the presence of God in the midst of the people. In the first oracle Haggai says to the people:

<sup>(18)</sup> See also CHILDS, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 469-470.

"I am with you, says the LORD" (1,13); similarly, he also says in the second oracle: "for I am with you, says the LORD of hosts" (2,4). In the third oracle the question of the relations between God and Israel arises, but this time God claims that the people are not with God: "yet you did not return to me, says the LORD" (2,17). The covenant relationship between God and his people is reflected in different terminology in the fourth oracle but with a similar meaning: "for I have chosen you, says the LORD of hosts" (2,23).

The nature of the relations between God and Israel following the destruction occupies a central place in the post-exilic literature. After the events of 587 BCE there was a widespread belief that the meaning of the Destruction was that God had cast off his people. The destruction of the Temple and the expulsion of the people from their land were interpreted by the people as severance of the relation between God and His people. For the people, the Temple constituted the place of the Divine Presence. The destruction of the Temple meant for the people that God had left the Temple. The people's exile because of their sins was considered as a loss of their status as the chosen people.

There is extensive biblical evidence of this feeling<sup>(19)</sup>. In Lam 3,18 the people are portrayed as suffering and as despairing of the possibility that God will deliver them. The feeling of the sufferer in this lament is that it is impossible to turn to God (3,8) and that there is no salvation from his situation (3,6). To counteract the feeling of despair that God will not deliver His people, the poet announces: "For the Lord will not reject forever" (3,31). The people's feeling that God had cast them off appears explicitly in Ezekiel 37<sup>(20)</sup>. In this prophecy, the dry bones are an expression of the people's loss of hope, their feeling that they will never return to their land<sup>(21)</sup>. The people's feeling of despair appears explicitly in Jer 33,24. These feelings are clearly evident in many places in Deutero-Isaiah. The prophet continually repeats the claim that Israel is the chosen people, as against the people's belief that God had cast them off (e.g.: Isa 40,27 -31, 41,8, 14; 43,1)<sup>(22)</sup>.

Evidently, this religious-psychological problem was not solved simultaneously with the return to Zion and not even with the rebuilding of the Temple. On the contrary, these events could reinforce the feeling that God was not in the people's midst. The economic difficulties and the modesty of the Temple strengthened the people's belief and feeling that God was not part of their existence<sup>(23)</sup>. The repetition of the idea in the book that God is with

<sup>(19)</sup> See E. ASSIS, "Why Edom? On the Hostility Towards Jacob's Brother in the Prophetic Literature", VT 56 (2006) 1-21.

<sup>(20)</sup> See e.g.: M. GREENBERG, *Ezekiel 1-20* (AB, New York 1983) 744-746.

<sup>(21)</sup> In fact, this type of thought might have already begun in the aftermath of the exile of 597, see Ezek. 8,12.

<sup>(22)</sup> See e.g.: J.N. OSWALT, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 40-66* (NICOT, Grand Rapids - Cambridge 1998) 9; M.C.A. KORPEL, "Second Isaiah's Coping with Religious Crisis: Reading Isaiah 40 and 55", *The Crisis of Israelite Religion. Transformation of Religious Tradition in Exilic and Post-Exilic Times* (eds. B. BECKING - M.C.A. KORPEL) (Leiden 1999) 90-105 (esp. 104-105).

<sup>(23)</sup> O. STECK, "Zu Haggai 1:2-11", ZAW 83 (1971) 374-377; J. TOLLINGTON, "Readings in Haggai: From the Prophet to the Completed Book, a Changing message in Changing Times", *The Crisis of Israelite Religion. Transformation of Religious Tradition in Exilic and Post-Exilic Times* (eds. B. BECKING - M.C.A. KORPEL) (Leiden 1999) 195.

the people shows that this is the basic problem Haggai confronts. This is a problem with which Zechariah also contended. He argues that God will choose Jerusalem (1,17), that He will again dwell within the people (2,14-15), and in Jerusalem (8,3), that the people will accept God and God will be the God of Israel (8,8)<sup>(24)</sup>.

The people did not build the Temple because they maintained that "the time has not yet come to rebuild the LORD's house" (1,2). This contention is generally considered to derive from the severe economic distress, and the difficulty in earmarking resources for the construction, when the people were weighed down with problems of daily existence<sup>(25)</sup>. Several scholars explain the delay along theological lines. According to Wellhausen, the people were awaiting the messianic period<sup>(26)</sup>. Clearly, the circumstances of the period, principally the severe economic situation, appear in the first oracle. However, the oracle reveals a deeper theological basis for the people's belief that the time had not yet come to build the Temple: they felt that God has not returned to His people after the destruction or after the return from exile, and that the rift between Israel and God still continued<sup>(27)</sup>.

I think that the concept behind the people's attitude towards the Samaritans derives also from the loosened relations of Israel with God (Hag 2,10-14). The people, according to this oracle, thought that it is possible and even advisable to intermingle with the Samaritan population. Perhaps, like the Samaritans themselves, the people believed that they were a part of Israel (Ezra 4,1-2). From Haggai's questions to the priests and his conclusion, the people's belief can be formulated in a different way. The prophet declares that if something unclean touches something clean it makes the clean unclean (2,13), whereas the clean does not purify the unclean (2,12). Assuming that this is an allegory for intermingling of Jews and non-Jews, the people's argument for marrying non-Israelite women is, contrary to Haggai's argument, that the "clean" purifies the "unclean". Namely, there is no problem in marrying gentiles, and on the contrary, in marriages of Jews with gentiles the Jew purifies the gentile.

The wish to integrate foreign elements in Israel appears also in Malachi, and there too a similar ideology of the people in relation to the question of intermarriage appears. The people hold a universalistic belief that all people are equal. In their opinion there is a general human covenant, which lowers

<sup>(24)</sup> See e.g. MITCHELL, *Haggai*, 128.

<sup>(25)</sup> See e.g.: J. BRIGHT, *A History of Israel* (London 1972) 366. Some explain that the delay in building the Temple lasted until the seventy-year period came to an end (Jer. 25,11-12; 27,6-7; 29,10). See: MEYERS – MEYERS, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8*, 20; BEDFORD, "Discerning the Time", 71-94; H. TADMOR, "'The Appointed Time Has Not Yet Arrived': The Historical Background of Haggai 1:2", *Ki Baruch Hu*. Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Judaic Studies in Honor of Baruch A. Levine (eds. R. CHAZAN – W.W. HALLO – L.H. SCHIFFMAN) (Winona Lake 1999) 401-408.

<sup>(26)</sup> J. WELLHAUSEN, *Die kleinen Propheten übersetzt und erklärt* (Berlin 1898) 173. See also STECK, "Zu Haggai 1:2-11", 373-378. According to Steck's analysis, verses 2, 4-8 are addressed to Judeans who had remained in Judah, and were reluctant to build the Temple for theological reasons, and vv. 9-11 were aimed at the new arrivals from Babylon who preferred to build their own houses instead of the Temple. See also: R.G. HAMERTON-KELLY, "The Temple and the Origins of Jewish Apocalyptic", *VT* 20 (1970) 1-15, esp. 14.

<sup>(27)</sup> See also: BEDFORD, "Discerning the Time", 71-94.

the nationalistic barriers<sup>(28)</sup>. This view, which blurs the differences between Israel and the nations, has its basis in the theological response of the people to the destruction, i.e. that Israel is not the chosen people. The implication of this belief is that if Judah is not unique, barriers should not be raised between Israel and the nations. Haggai expresses a nationalistic point of view: the special relationship between God and Israel remains unaltered, and therefore, there must be a distinction between Jews and foreign elements<sup>(29)</sup>.

In both oracles, therefore, the first and the third, the prophet admonishes the people openly, telling them to build the Temple, and not to involve others in this activity. This admonition stands against the doubts which the people still have on their status and their uniqueness, and their relationship to God.

The most serious problem as regards the messages that Haggai endeavours to transmit to his listeners is the reality that supports precisely the people's understanding and interpretation of the reality. The second oracles in each part are designed to contend with this problem. After laying the Temple foundations, the people were strengthened in their belief that God indeed was not with them. They had expected that after the exile the situation would revert to what it had been formerly. Not only did this not happen, but on the contrary, the Temple was small and modest. The people's interpretation was that God was not present in this reality. Therefore, they disparaged the Temple. Neither the size nor the glory of the Temple was the issue; the small dimensions and lack of sumptuousness received a theological significance, namely that God was not with the people<sup>(30)</sup>. Haggai contended with this problem in the oracle of consolation - the second oracle. Haggai does not deny the current reality; the solution to the problem according to Haggai is in the future beyond the horizon. In the future, in the framework of cataclysmic changes the desired reality will come to fruition.

The problem appearing in the fourth oracle is also to be understood in this way. The people consider that if the current reality is divine, the status of the scion of the House of David must be significant and high. Zerubbabel's status, however, was inferior. He was a satrap, subject to Persian rule which he obeyed. Upon this point too, Haggai does not interpret the reality otherwise, and does not explain it apologetically. The people's expectations regarding the status of the scion of the House of David are correct. In this case too, Haggai suggests that the people wait patiently for major changes that will occur in the world; only then will the awaited situation come to pass. Again Haggai endeavours to explain to the people that the anticipated reality will arrive in the framework of an unexpected revolutionary process.

Haggai's says that the changes will occur in the framework of cataclysmic upheavals - in the framework of changes in world orders and in the natural orders. This is because Haggai apparently understands that significant change cannot be anticipated in the foreseeable reality. Therefore he projects the

<sup>(28)</sup> For universalistic and particularistic trends during the period of exile and restoration, see: M. WEINFELD, "Universalism and Particularism in the Period of Exile and Restoration", *Tarbiz* 33 (1964) 228-242.

<sup>(29)</sup> A similar concept is also found among those who were exiled in 597 BCE as is evident in Ezek 20,32-37.

<sup>(30)</sup> On "Glory" as a signifier of God presence see: MEYERS – MEYERS, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8*, 54.

complete remedying of the people's situation into a reality existing beyond that which can be anticipated normally. The people must not wait impatiently for a change because this will not happen naturally and simply.

According to the book of Haggai the people thought that reality must be transparent and clear and not subject to different interpretations. They expected renewal of 'our days as of old' (Lam 5,21) to be immediate. What Haggai says is that the anticipated reality will arrive, but it will arrive gradually. It will not be a one-time event, but a long process. Haggai asks the people to wait patiently.

\*  
\* \*

In the two parts of the book the direction of the progression is from admonition to consolation, from existential oracles to oracles that relate to the people's cognition. In both parts there is a progression from current demands made upon the people to divine promises of cataclysmic change in the future that will lead to realisation of the people's expectations of redemption. This structure presents a way of contending with the difference between expectations and reality. While the people feel unstable in the current situation, Haggai suggests that they act as strenuously as possible in the present. As regards the unrealised expectations, Haggai asks the people to wait patiently for crucial processes that in due time will lead to the awaited changes, both in the status of the Temple and of the King. As against the expectations for immediate changes, Haggai suggests anticipation of gradual changes and ultimately the great destinies will be realised.

Haggai's greatness lies in his firm position regarding the people's positive future, despite the difficult reality of the present. Scholars have generally tended to treat Haggai negatively. They saw him as a dry, boring prophet, and an epigone<sup>(31)</sup>; others indicated that Haggai is indeed a minor prophet, and that he has no spiritual message<sup>(32)</sup>. Yet his ability to stand up at a difficult time for the people and to encourage them to build the Temple, and to anticipate realisation of their expectations in the future, despite the economic difficulties and the theological doubts, points to Haggai's leadership and the strength of his faith<sup>(33)</sup>. While the role of the pre-exilic prophets was to warn of the destruction, Haggai's and Zechariah's role was to build and rehabilitate the physically and spiritually destroyed people (\*).

Department of Bible Studies  
Bar Ilan University  
Ramat-Gan 52900; Israel

Elie ASSIS

<sup>(31)</sup> See e.g. G. FOHRER, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (London 1968) 460; J.A. BEWER, *The Literature of the Old Testament* (New York 1933) 235-236. Against this Judgment see: J. LINDBLOM, *Prophecy in Ancient Israel* (Oxford 1962) 421; M.J. BODA, "Haggai: Master Rhetorician", *Tyndale Bulletin* 51 (2000) 295-304.

<sup>(32)</sup> T.H. ROBINSON, *Prophecy and the Prophets in Ancient Israel* (London 1979) 177; W.L. SPERRY, 'The Book of Haggai' (IB, New York 1956) VI, 1039.

<sup>(33)</sup> See: P.R. ACKROYD, "Studies in the Book of Haggai", *JSS* (1952) 9-13; K. KOCH, *The Prophets* (London 1983) II, 160.

(\*) I would like to acknowledge the kind support of "Beit Shalom" - Japan.

## SUMMARY

This article uncovers a sophisticated structure of the Book of Haggai and its significance. The structure of the book is part of the rhetoric of the prophet to contend with the people's thoughts that reality did not meet their hopes. They expected in vain the renewal of the 'old days' to be immediate. Therefore, they believed that God was not with them and felt they were still rejected by Him. Haggai argues to the contrary: God was with them despite the seemingly desperate situation, and the anticipated reality was bound to materialize, but only gradually. The Book's structure also shows that it is not a random collection of oracles but one unified literary work.



# RES BIBLIOGRAPHICAE

## A Feminist Reading of the Decalogue(s)<sup>(1)</sup>

What is the object of a feminist reading of the Bible? No doubt, there is no single answer. Even individual authors exhibit a multiplicity of objectives, as appears to be the case with the book under review<sup>(2)</sup>. Sivan seeks to mediate between “mainstream” biblical scholarship and a feminist reading. Put very broadly, the former adopts an “historical” approach, while the latter seeks to read the material in the light of modern, feminist concerns. The latter approach is indicated by Athalya Brenner in her Preface, where she describes (ix) the aim of the (sub-)series as “to problematize contemporaneous authoritative and cultural meanings of bibles by focusing on the processes of transmission, readership and actualization of biblical texts up to and including the Twenty-First Century”.

But “mainstream” (historical) scholarship has itself come to incorporate feminist perspectives in a number of different ways, as Sivan’s own presentation often indicates<sup>(3)</sup>: the feminist agenda may (i) sensitise us to historical issues regarding the life and thought of ancient Israel, which otherwise we might overlook — an attempt to infer an ancient Israelite social psychology (inferred from its texts)<sup>(4)</sup>; (ii) provide access to “authentic” readings of texts, interpretations which seek to recover both the male and females “voices” of the ancient writers or readers<sup>(5)</sup>; and (iii) contribute to the methodology by which we may approach such historical questions. In varying degrees, Sivan’s book seeks to do all of these, as well as offering a reading overtly addressed to contemporary concerns. Yet this combination of objectives generates problems at the level of expression: there is a necessary

<sup>(1)</sup> Hagith SIVAN, *Between Woman, Man and God. A New Interpretation of the Ten Commandments* (JSOTSS 401; Bible in the Twenty-First Century 4), London – New York, T&T Clark 2004. xii-270 p. 15,5 × 23,5. £30.00.

<sup>(2)</sup> I have profited from comments offered by Dr. Deborah Rooke, of King’s College London, on a previous draft. She is not, of course, to be taken to agree with everything here stated.

<sup>(3)</sup> Thus, for example, she draws on some of the articles in *Gender and Law in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East* (ed. V.H. MATTHEWS – B.M. LEVINSON – T. FRYMER-KENSKY) (JSOTS 262; Sheffield 1998), but not that of Frymer-Kensky on virginity (nor any of her other work). C.B. ANDERSON’s *Women, Ideology, and Violence. Critical Theory and the Construction of Gender in the Book of the Covenant and the Deuteronomical Law* (London 2004) appeared too late to be taken into account.

<sup>(4)</sup> Expressed, for example, in the desire “to read the biblical mega-narrative (law and lore inclusive) as an attempt to come to terms with a deep-seated conflict that marks Israelite manhood as a product of relations with a specific God on the one hand, and as an ideology that must participate in a non-Israelite human environment on the other” (12).

<sup>(5)</sup> As in the claim that the Decalogue “aspires to ensure that no free man becomes so weakened by desire as to step out of the ferociously maintained hierarchy which places all free Israelite males above women, slaves, foreigners and resident aliens” (226). On the problem of recovering any authentic female voice from male texts, see further *infra*, at n. 42.

tension between the registers of historical discourse on the one hand, rhetorical discourse on the other (and one which cannot itself be resolved in gendered terms).

In this context, we may observe also a distinction between the agenda of Sivan's title, and that of her subtitle. The former relates to the life and thought of ancient Israel, reconstructed on the evidence of the biblical texts; the latter relates to one particular text (in two versions), the Decalogue, and the manner in which it may be read. Both contribute to "mainstream" scholarship — insofar, in the latter case, as Sivan makes claims to the manner in which that text might have been understood in ancient times.

That the life and thought of ancient Israel was fundamentally patriarchal and gender-biased is nowadays generally accepted. However, Sivan, while making the occasional concession<sup>(6)</sup>, is inclined to force the evidence in seeking the most extreme versions of such claims. Thus, for example, "In spite of a rhetoric of parental equality, the image of the mother, even of motherhood itself, remains a dubious proposition, at best, and a necessary evil at worst" (111). No mention, here of the *torat imekhah* of Prov 1,8; 6,20 nor of the reversal of the normal male-female hierarchical sequence (which elsewhere she takes as significant) in Lev 19,3: "You shall each revere his mother and his father and keep my Sabbath".

Sivan accepts that her selection of the material is ideologically driven: "I have intentionally placed the feminine at the heart of a biblical vision of a thoroughly masculine version of humanity. It seems to me that only in this 'unnatural' setting it is possible to explore in full how notions of sexual difference, rather than of sexual equality, frame concepts of patriarchal oppression of women..." (227); such ideologies of biblical womanhood "provide a rich canvas of complicity and counterbalancing in spite of clear patriarchal agenda and andocentric (sic) biases" (12). Here it seems, she moves from historical discourse to contemporary concerns — even if it is not possible conceptually entirely to eliminate the latter from the former.

### 1. *The Decalogues and Biblical Textual Traditions*

When we turn from life and thought to Sivan's treatment of the Decalogue, the particular document which is the organising focus for this book, the problems increase. While eschewing the possibility of "an analysis of the Decalogue within a conventional historical context" (3-4), Sivan seeks to correlate — albeit noting exceptions<sup>(7)</sup> — the two versions (in Exod 20 and Deut 5) with the laws and narratives of the Tetrateuch<sup>(8)</sup> (within which

<sup>(6)</sup> For example, while maintaining that the homicide laws contemplate relations between males, she accepts that "the rules do not deny that the spilt blood of a woman calls for a suitable revenge" (143).

<sup>(7)</sup> Thus: "Curiously, Gen. 3.6 employs the terminology of Deuteronomy (5.17), rather than that of the Exodus Decalogue, to describe the object of covetousness" (214).

<sup>(8)</sup> Sivan is thus able to offer the following interpretation of its conclusion (Num 36): "Israel's 'primordial' history, unfolding in Genesis-Numbers, ends thus on an intimate note, with a recording of the marriage of the five daughters of Zelophehad ... The role of women as wives and mothers, as well as transmitters of parental property, is thus affirmed. The ultimate story of Israel in the wilderness comes to an end with the domestication of women by law. The 'state' stands in for a father, and male relatives appropriate paternal rights.

conventional source critical considerations are largely ignored)<sup>(9)</sup> on the one hand and the Deuteronomistic history on the other. The textual differences between the two versions of the Decalogue (where they exist)<sup>(10)</sup> provide at least a starting point for such an analysis<sup>(11)</sup> (though not all are exploited), notably in the different motive clauses of the Sabbath commandment: “The Yahweh of Deuteronomy’s Sabbath is no longer a creator but a warrior. In Deuteronomic imagination the divinity’s fighting attributes become a mechanical exaltation of imaginary male virtues” (95).

But Sivan seeks to go much further, in positing different interpretations within her Tetrateuchal and Deuteronomistic textual traditions even where the Decalogue text itself is unchanged. She argues, for example, that idolatry is differently understood, given the differences in the (orgiastic) Exodus and (non-orgiastic) Deuteronomic accounts of the golden calf story (52-53)<sup>(12)</sup>. She sees a difference in the traditions’ understanding of murder, arguing that perhaps the most remarkable contribution of Deuteronomy to murder is “its deliberate intrusion into a domicile, rather than into an open and all-male space, and into marital relations, rather than an all-male network” (143). She does this through Deut 22,13-21, the “case of the slandered bride”, which

---

With this reassuring touch of reasserted masculine values, the law curbs justice. The familial ‘respect’ which the five women had demonstrated is used as a weapon to curtail their independence. ‘Balance’ returns” (114). On this narrative, see further 553 *infra*.

<sup>(9)</sup> Thus, she uses the slavery laws of the *Mishpatim* (Exod 21,2-11) to interpret the first commandment, because of the reference in the latter to the liberation from Egypt. A more common analysis would explain the location and arrangement of the *Mishpatim* in terms of its (late) incorporation into the Sinai pericope, already including the Decalogue, rather than the use of the *Mishpatim* to interpret the Decalogue. On the relationship to the manumission laws, she might have referred to the monograph of David Daube, *The Exodus Pattern in the Bible* (London 1963), now reprinted in D. DAUBE, *Collected Works of David Daube* (ed. C.M. CARMICHAEL) (Berkeley, CA 2003) III, 101-156. Her approach also prompts difficulties in accounting for the relationship between Genesis narratives and Levitical law: whereas Leviticus 20,10 provides a death penalty for adultery, she observes that no narratives in Genesis-Numbers bear it out (164-165; see also 174-175 on the stories of Tamar in Gen 38 and Joseph in Gen 39). But this fits with an early stage of institutionalisation represented in the Genesis narratives, where adultery remains a matter for private settlement.

<sup>(10)</sup> Sivan locates within the Deuteronomic framework the third and ninth commandments in so far as they appoint Yahweh as judge and allude to court judgments (73). But there is nothing specifically Deuteronomic in the text of the Decalogue at this point; why could the same not be said within the framework of the Exodus version?

<sup>(11)</sup> Thus, in a section entitled “Deuteronomy’s Ideology of Coveting: Why is Woman First?”, she ponders the fact that the Exodus version puts *bayit* first, while Deuteronomy puts the wife as the first object of coveting, suggesting that the order in Deuteronomy “implies that covert coveting of other men’s wives is more pervasive and more complex than the rest of the listed inventory” (but why?). Further on, she tries to have it both ways: “Deuteronomy’s Tenth Commandment sets aside woman from the rest of man’s immediate environment to emphasise both the interchangeability of woman with other items of property, and to highlight the close connection between them” (220). She avoids the argument that the sequence represents some kind hierarchy, and thus that the status of the wife is greater in Deuteronomy than in Exodus. Indeed, while the Decalogue acknowledges the strength of household bonding, the Tenth Commandment in particular constructs the home as “man’s exclusive domain and as a metaphorical extension of the individual male member of the Covenant” (208).

<sup>(12)</sup> The stress in the Deuteronomic version on the mere making of images is taken to be the more “literal and, perhaps, the least convincing” (because, presumably, it is the least feminist) interpretation.

“nicely illustrates both the application of legal procedures to instances that can lead to judicial execution, and what Roland Barth so aptly calls ‘murder by language’”: “The integrity of the female hymen becomes a subject of slander in a potentially deadly male interaction”. But Deuteronomy 22,13-21 is a straightforward accusation by the husband that his new wife must have committed adultery (a breach of the seventh commandment) during the period of betrothal<sup>(13)</sup>. Sivan’s attempt to locate it within the “anatomy of murder” depends upon taking it as murder by a judicial process, on the assumption that an innocent wife may be condemned by the process, for lack of the required evidence of *betulim*.

As may already be apparent, Sivan’s “interpretation” of the Decalogue is a broad and elusive concept. In principle, it appears to encompass intertextualities, sometimes rather remote, with anything in the Tetrachord and the Deuteronomistic History (and sometimes beyond). Thus, chapter two deals with the first two commandments (in the Jewish designation), interpreting monotheism in terms of monogamy, prompted by the use of the term “jealous God” (28-29), which is taken to evoke the prophetic “marriage metaphor”<sup>(14)</sup> and, less convincingly, by suggesting that the “house of bondage” (Exod 20,2) “evokes the ubiquitous ‘paternal clan’ (*bet ‘av*)”. That leads, reasonably enough, to the narrative of the golden calf, where she argues (40) that Exod 32,20 (where the Israelites are made to drink the dust of the golden calf) evokes the procedure of the *sotah* ordeal in Num 5. Less convincingly, she seeks here to incorporate also the narrative of the relations between Moses, Aaron and Miriam in Num 12, where Aaron and Miriam criticise Moses for his marriage to a Cushite woman and thus challenge his superior status (but Miriam [alone] is punished by leprosy, until Moses intercedes for her). She wonders whether the intention here was “to introduce the kind of internal rifts which exogamic or polytheistic marriage may cause” (44).

Sivan’s somewhat ambivalent<sup>(15)</sup> conflation in ch. 3 of the third and ninth

<sup>(13)</sup> Sivan follows the traditional view, that the husband accuses her of not having been a virgin on the wedding night, following the rejection by C. PRESSLER, *The View of Women Found in the Deuteronomistic Family Laws* (Berlin 1993) 25-28, of the view of G.J. WENHAM, “*BeTULAH ‘A Girl of Marriageable Age’*”, VT 22 (1972) 326-348, that the wife is accused of already being pregnant by another man (a view supported more recently by J.P. BURNSIDE, *The Signs of Sin* [Sheffield 2003] 137-147). But even if the traditional view is correct, the accusation is not simply one of “pre-marital sex” (Sivan, 181), since relations with another man even during the period of betrothal are themselves treated as adultery, as Deut 22,23-24 makes clear. Indeed, Pressler herself deals with it in a chapter entitled “Laws Concerning Adultery: Deuteronomy 22:13-29”.

<sup>(14)</sup> Sivan’s tendency to understand *everything* in gendered terms is reflected, *inter alia*, in her further extension of the metaphor where we read of the “God that had effected divorce from Egypt” (20), and in her argument: “If altars possessed gender characteristics, they would have been ‘masculine’, precisely because their erection demands the application of male hands while their shape prevents the exposure of male private parts” (34).

<sup>(15)</sup> However, she accepts that there is a different “focus” to the two commandments: that of the third is on the “idle and empty use of the divine name”; the ninth on “the negativity of perjury” (69). Thus, both “highlight the misuse of speech, a form of the original sin itself”, since in paradise “the serpent ‘discusses’ the validity of divine threats, advising the dissolution of the verbal contract (or ‘oath’ or ‘covenant’) between Yahweh and humans (Gen. 3)”. She speaks vaguely of “conceptual varieties of an oath” and maintains that “Without going so far as to claim unwarranted duplication, both Commandments characterise the distortion of truth in terms of sins of speaking” (67).

commandments<sup>(16)</sup> (taking God's name in vain and false testimony<sup>(17)</sup>) rests on an erroneous and anachronistic assumption that testimony in the Hebrew Bible was given on oath. The narrative sources deployed to interpret the third commandment (taking God's name in vain), include not only Jephthah's vow, but also Esther, Yael, Rahab (to whom is attributed an "unspoken oath of hospitality", 79) and Ruth (partly in the light of her vow to Naomi).

Rahab, compared to Eve (104), reappears in the narrative sources deployed to interpret the fourth commandment<sup>(18)</sup>, since Jericho fell on "a 'Sabbath'" (i.e. the seventh day of circling and trumpeting)<sup>(19)</sup>. The deposition, on a sabbath, of Athalia in favour of her grandson prompts the question whether the sabbath is "a day sanctified for killing of women and for war against Israel's declared enemies? The Sabbath, both of creation and liberation, endeavours to reaffirm males in power and authorize a version of history that expresses what male members of society want or imagine themselves to be" (105-106).

The family solidarity (and parental unity) assumed by the fifth commandment is more understandably juxtaposed with Genesis narratives. In particular: "Communications across generations in Genesis appear to contradict rather than confirm the Fifth Word. The anticipated reward of the respect by an elder son (Esau) to father (Isaac) is thwarted by a 'rebellious' younger son (Jacob), whose 'rebelliousness' is encouraged, indeed orchestrated by his mother" (118). But the concerns of the Genesis narrator are with succession to the covenantal promise (and that within a family not averse to polygamous unions); both the preference of younger children and the lack of parental unity involved in achieving it are directed to this larger ideological objective (as interpreted in the light of the historical circumstances of the writers). Of course, within the narrative chronology, all this occurs before the giving of the Decalogue; an alternative overall literary reading of the relationships would be that of Carmichael, according to which the Decalogue might be viewed precisely as a reaction to the lack of respect here shown<sup>(20)</sup>.

<sup>(16)</sup> However, she rightly notes the combination in Exod 23,1 of uttering a "false report" (*shema shav*) with joining with the wicked to be an *ed hamas* (68). But the fact that the verse can combine the two without difficulty rather supports the view that the offence of the witness does *not* in fact involve a false oath. Thus, it may be an elaboration of the ninth commandment: do not spread false reports even if you do not formally testify in court, rather than a combination of the third and ninth commandments.

<sup>(17)</sup> The one linguistic difference between the two versions, in this context, namely the replacement by Deuteronomy of Exodus's *eid sheker* with *eid shav*, is not discussed. The commentary immediately addresses issues of sexual relations, on the grounds that the *sotah* procedure itself involves the administration of an oath (64). Moreover, the conception of the role of the oath, though stated in the context of *sotah*, is rather limited: "An oath, then, speaks of discord. Its contents aim at preventing, or at ending acts of rebellion and divergence". This overlooks completely the concept of the promissory oath, which is more likely to be the referent of the third commandment than "perjury, slander and defamation".

<sup>(18)</sup> On Sivan's argument that sabbath rest is not extended to the wife, see *infra*, at 550f.

<sup>(19)</sup> See Sivan, 105. Similarly (99), it appears to be the reference to the Sabbath and new moon in 2 Kgs 4,23 which prompts Sivan to analyse the story of the Shunammite woman in the context of the Decalogue's Sabbath commandment (96-102).

<sup>(20)</sup> Though in his *The Origins of Biblical Law* (Ithaca, NY 1992) 37-38, he actually takes the commandment as a reaction to the offence of Cain — like Sivan, attaching significance to the use of *adamah* in the Decalogue's motive clause. This alternative suggestion is not considered by Sivan.

Sivan proceeds in this context to discuss “Moses and Maternity”: Exodus 2 “explores the implications of” the fifth commandment “by fragmenting maternity and by distributing its components among several female bearers of identity” (119)<sup>(21)</sup>. The next section turns to “Deuteronomy’s Disobedient Sons and Unruly Daughters”, juxtaposing the *ben sorer umoreh* of Deut 21,18 with the wife accused of unchastity by her husband after the first night (Deut 22,13-21) as “two sides of the same coin”. Though Sivan appears to take the traditional view of *betulim*, in the latter text, as ‘tokens of virginity’, she rightly views the suspicion as having arisen from an all-too-quick pregnancy, and suggests that it is no coincidence that the case of male rebelliousness focuses on the belly, the closest equivalent to the woman’s womb. Ingenious as this suggested parallel may be, it ignores the difficulty of regarding *zolel vesove* in Deut 21,20b as central to the offence, rather than a (perhaps editorial) exemplification of rebelliousness. Moreover, there is no literary support for regarding these two cases as opposite sides of the same coin; there is a substantial amount of unrelated material between them, and the case of the daughter commences a series of paragraphs concerned with sexual offences by women, focusing on adultery. Sivan’s chapter concludes with a discussion of the story of Samson, taken to exemplify the proverbial stereotype of the wayward son who betrays the hopes of his mother by indulging in drink and in sex with foreign women.

Both the Decalogue and the laws, Sivan argues in chapter six, present the sixth commandment, homicide, as an inter-male affair<sup>(22)</sup>. The narratives, she maintains, present a different picture, with gender issues often playing an important part. Thus, the three wife-sister narratives in Genesis provide “metaphors of murders” in which “murder is prevented at the cost of actual or potential adultery” (135)<sup>(23)</sup>. She takes the (Deuteronomistic) cycle commencing with the rape of Tamar<sup>(24)</sup>, the killing of Amnon by Absalom and the supposed killing of the son of the woman of Tekoa (in pursuance of a plot to secure the return of Absalom from exile) as reflecting “an inner-biblical interpretation which extends the meaning of the Sixth Word to a deadly confrontation between the sexes through rape” (151). These narratives, together with the story of Batsheva, “compliment (sic) and supplement the gaps in the legal material dealing with murder. They highlight

(21) Moreover, in “Moses’ nativity myth”, the “tension in the drama further lies in the distinction between birth from human beings, and (re)birth from water. The fecundity of the Nile and sexual reproduction have been confused with each other, because to restore Moses, product of both sex and river, to his original familial alliance, separation and covenant must be effected. In the passage between birth, in Exodus 2, and ‘rebirth’ in Exodus 4, the parental couple becomes irrelevant”. But what do these interesting, if somewhat extreme, proposals have to do with the Decalogue?

(22) She hesitates to conclude that the Decalogue provision deals with the wilful killing of males only, but notes that in the Hebrew Bible women never kill other women (133).

(23) She concedes, however, that only Gen 26 “drives home the moral dimension not only of adultery but also of killing, by linking the two through a royal decree that threatens death to potential killers (of Isaac) and takers (of Rebecca) (26:11)” (136). She argues interestingly that the Mesopotamian Nippur case “provides the kind of scenario which Abraham and Isaac endeavored to dodge by passing off their wives as their sisters” (137).

(24) Sivan seeks to present Tamar’s rape in terms of “a (metaphorical) murder”, noting that Deut 22,25-27 compares murder to rape (148). But the latter text deals with a *betrothed* woman (unlike Tamar); as the context indicates, the real issue there is thus adultery.



the shortcomings of legal systems that aspire to protect the interests of males often at the expense of women". Even if this view of the legal system was shared by the narrators of these narratives, their "gap-filling" role is surely a function of the modern interpreter. More credibly, Sivan argues, the story of the killing of Naboth, and particularly Jezebel's role in it, shows the co-involvement, at the narrative level, of different commandments: though Jezebel sought Naboth's death, there was no penalty in the law for plotting a murder, nor does the tenth commandment directly contemplate murder as a result of covetousness. The narrative combines these separate elements: a covetous king and a murderous wife (153). "What makes the tale of Jezebel, Ahab and Naboth particularly useful for the promotion of the morality advocated in the Decalogue is its association with other commandments and other legal texts... By juxtaposing several transgressions, the story of Jezebel and Naboth illustrates the scope and various configurations of murder" (155). That may well be true, but we may ask in what sense it qualifies as an "interpretation" of the sixth commandment?

Similarly, in relation to theft<sup>(25)</sup>, the eighth commandment, Sivan presents the seduction of Exod 22,15-16 as "a type of" theft, namely the 'stealing' of an intact hymen (193). There is, indeed, a wide measure of scholarly agreement that seduction is here regarded as an interference with the property rights of the father of the girl. It does not follow that it should be associated with the Decalogue prohibition of theft. Indeed, narrative methodology should direct our attention to typical instances of the use of concepts in social life<sup>(26)</sup>: here, the sheep-stealing contemplated both in Exod 21,37 and 22,3 and in Nathan's parable<sup>(27)</sup>.

Sivan leaves a number of important mainstream interpretative issues relating to the Decalogue largely unaddressed. Are we to assume that they all carried the same "weight" — despite the fact that some — but not all — are given more concrete expression in the laws by the specification of (a variety) of sanctions? Related to this: is the Decalogue designed for divine or human enforcement, and what is the relationship between the two? Sivan most closely approaches these questions in discussing the third commandment: "Left to God, the sin of perjury becomes a matter 'not of the justice of man but of divine sanction'. This is precisely what the third commandment implies, with its insistence on Yahweh's personal vengeance. ... Perjury, in this reading, is

<sup>(25)</sup> When the law delves into the precise relations between thieves and victims, Sivan claims, it "depicts an all-male realm in which a temporary exchange of property is done on trust (Exod. 22:6-14)" (193). This latter passage includes provisions regarding the shepherd. But Rachel herself is described as a shepherd in Gen 29,6. Was that, we may ask, so atypical that the Exodus provisions would have been understood as all-male?

<sup>(26)</sup> See my *Studies in the Semiotics of Biblical Law* (Sheffield 2000) 27-29; "Literal Meaning: Semantics and Narrative in Biblical Law and Modern Jurisprudence", *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law / Revue Internationale de Sémiotique Juridique* 13/4 (2000) 433-457.

<sup>(27)</sup> Sivan argues: "In the present order of the Decalogue, theft follows murder and adultery, as though such transgressions are measured along a sliding scale of severity. Within this triad, stealing and adultery may not be entirely distinct, and both can lead to murder" (188). However, in discussing Nathan's parable in the chapter on adultery, a few pages earlier (184-187), she fails to pursue the implicit analogy between Batsheva and the sheep in the parable, and the application there of the fourfold restitution of Exod 22,3.



tantamount to disbelief and hence to idolatry. Of the Ten Commandments only the Second and the Third carry a penalty devised and administered by Yahweh. Both Commandments are decipherable in terms of reserving for God the task of sorting out offenders" (66). But the fact that some of the commandments do attract institutional human penalties elsewhere in biblical law is hardly a conceptual difference: there, too, there is always the possibility, sometimes even the likelihood, that the human institutions will fail and divine justice will be required<sup>(28)</sup>. The conceptual issue, rather, is whether divinely-mandated human justice is regarded as a separate system at all, or rather just one aspect of the claim of Deut 1,17 that (all) justice is divine<sup>(29)</sup>.

## 2. A Feminist Methodology?

Two features of Sivan's (feminist?)(<sup>30</sup>) methodological approach are worthy of note.

The first is her use of narrative exemplifications to provide contextual meanings for otherwise general Decalogue provisions. This rests on an insight of great significance (and not restricted to feminists)(<sup>31</sup>): we have a natural tendency to construct sense in narrative terms, despite the use of general or even abstract language. "Thou shalt not kill" will conjure up an image of a form of killing with which the particular audience is familiar<sup>(32)</sup>, and this image will include contextual concomitants. In viewing various narratives and laws as intertextually related to more than one Decalogue provision, Sivan recognises that these contextual concomitants will often overlap<sup>(33)</sup>: in social life, the Decalogue provisions are not to be viewed atomistically<sup>(34)</sup>. This is not to say, however, that all narratives may be uncritically assigned interpretative roles in respect of the Decalogue (as noted above in relation to the Sabbath commandment). We need to take account of particular narrative

<sup>(28)</sup> Sivan observes that God emerges as the blood avenger *par excellence*, noting my view that *ba'adam* in Gen 9,6 means "for man" rather than "by man" (143).

<sup>(29)</sup> See further B.S. JACKSON, "The Practice of Justice in Jewish Law", *Daimon* 4 (2004) 31-48.

<sup>(30)</sup> I am aware that this is a contentious matter. I see in Sivan's work some leanings towards (and beyond) the approach associated with C. GILLIGAN, *In a Different Voice* (Cambridge, MA 1982). On the implications of such epistemological feminism for law and legal theory, see my *Making Sense in Law* (Liverpool 1995) 104-110, 305-319; *Making Sense in Jurisprudence* (Liverpool 1996) 311-338.

<sup>(31)</sup> See further n. 26, *supra*. The "narrative turn" has been especially significant in psychology. See my *Making Sense in Law*, *supra* n. 30, esp. chs. 10-12.

<sup>(32)</sup> Noting that adultery in the Decalogue is neither defined nor given a punishment, Sivan observes that, like other provisions of the Decalogue, it assumes the familiarity of its audience with its ideology and meaning (164). Here, we may note, she seems to be seeking a reconstruction of the meaning to the original audience.

<sup>(33)</sup> For example, Deut 22,13-21 is evoked by Sivan in the context of the third commandment (74).

<sup>(34)</sup> The manner of handling these overlaps remains, however, open to discussion. In her desire to attribute gendered significance to all the commandments, Sivan (in a section entitled: "Killing for Lust? The Female Body as Motivation of Murder") argues that the thrice-told brother-sister story in Genesis, Tamar, and the wise woman of the Tekoa, "each further elucidate the scope and repercussions of transgressing the sixth word" (148). But has she not got it the wrong way round? Do these stories not illustrate the potentially fatal repercussions of adultery, rather than the "repercussions" of homicide?

objectives. Sivan argues: "To judge by the Genesis tales, the most common form of killing at the dawn of ancestral history was the murder, actual or potential, of one brother by another, or by other brothers. The Sixth Word and its legal exegesis... do not contemplate such specificity nor the role of family members in the aftermath, with the exception of the so-called 'blood avenger'. The narratives fill the gap" (139). Is this, however, a gap in our understanding of the Decalogue, or simply a claim that the Decalogue is not, after all, to be interpreted as a comprehensive summary of Israelite ethics?

A second methodological characteristic of Sivan's work is, to this reader at least, more problematic: the use of highly associative (even "lateral") thinking in making connections between different texts. What is one to make of statements like the following: "Rachel carries an integral part of her home with her to a new home in Canaan. Paradoxically, then, she carries with her the seeds of idolatry to the promised land of her husband's ancestry, just as Eve had carried the seeds of knowledge from the Garden of Eden to human abodes" (199). Or the conceptual leaps<sup>(35)</sup> involved in arguing that "Genesis defines the conception of prohibited 'food' as a violation of trust, which is precisely the essence of oath breaking. It depicts humans (and reptiles) as a group potentially prone to perjury, in its widest sense" (69).

One might expect a feminist methodology to address the gendered character of biblical linguistic structures, but these are largely assumed rather than discussed. Thus, because the Decalogue uses the second person masculine singular, its provisions "address individual Israelite males only" (11)<sup>(36)</sup>. A parallel issue is the interpretation of the term *ish*. In respect of both, we need to ask whether and when the usage implies a "marked" or "unmarked" opposition: both *ish* and the masculine gender are sometimes "unmarked", thus gender inclusive (male or female), at other times "marked", thus gender specific (male as opposed to female)<sup>(37)</sup>. The author appears to assume that they are always to be regarded as "marked", but a full investigation would reveal that both can be used in either way, and that a decision has to be made for each individual usage in the light of context<sup>(38)</sup>. Thus, Sivan claims that the wife is omitted as a beneficiary of the Sabbath, despite the fact that it proceeds to include sons and daughters, servants and maidservants<sup>(39)</sup>, without considering whether that

<sup>(35)</sup> Often recognised through the use of "scare quotes", as at 173: "Genesis 38 features Tamar as a woman who actively solicits 'adultery' with her own father-in-law who had failed to provide her with a third husband".

<sup>(36)</sup> Where the language is "egalitarian", this is at best grudgingly conceded: thus, "Encoding birth, the Fifth commandment provides unique, if perfunctory recognition of the role of parents in the process of engendering humans" (108).

<sup>(37)</sup> It remains, of course, true that neither the feminine gender nor *ishah* can be used in an "unmarked" (gender inclusive) manner, and this difference represents a significant aspect of the gender bias of the Hebrew language.

<sup>(38)</sup> See ANDERSON, *Women, Ideology, and Violence*, *supra* n.3, ch. 2, for a systematic examination of the applicability to women of the laws of the Covenant Code and Deuteronomy, distinguishing between inclusive laws which explicitly refer to women and those where the reference to women is implicit (22-36).

<sup>(39)</sup> "The Sabbath text trivializes marriage and motherhood through a tacit assumption that 'daughters' ultimately become wives and mothers of other men" (96; cf. 89, 90). She maintains: "The commandments are framed in the second person masculine not merely because they reflect a male-oriented society but also because they entrust males with the guardianship of the female body" (226).

very egalitarian language provides a contextual reason to interpret the second person singular masculine verb and pronoun, “you”, as here unmarked<sup>(40)</sup>. Only in her final chapter, entitled “Are We, Women, the Addressees? Collected and Closing Reflections” does Sivan pose the general question whether the Decalogue is (or was) addressed to women. She concludes that “it applies primarily to men but its import extends to women and its lessons are driven most forcibly through narratives that extend to women” (222-223).

The gendered character of language appears also in biblical semantics. Thus, the verb *kabed* in the fifth commandment is “borrowed from a masculine language of war and politics” and “is notably absent from descriptions which touch on relations between the sexes in general, and between mothers and ‘children’ in particular”, leading Mal 1,6 to “paraphrase the Fifth Word by positing not the parental couple in apposition with Yahweh but only the father” (109). But the Malachi paraphrase is in divine *oratio directa* (“A son respects his father... if a father I am, where is my honor?”). Sivan may certainly complain that God is predominantly depicted as father rather than mother, and even that models of respect are themselves gendered, but Malachi can hardly be used to diminish the mother’s inclusion in the Decalogue command; if anything, it appears all the more striking in the light of Sivan’s argument<sup>(41)</sup>.

### 3. Law and Narrative

Insofar as Sivan views the narratives as providing evidence of the social contexts in which the laws might be applied, her attempt to provide an integrated account of the two genres is to be applauded. More specifically, she claims that the (male) laws are to be analysed “mostly along the line of ‘mainstream’ scholarship” (16), while the narratives often appear to be subversive of the ideology reflected in the laws in the roles they attribute to women. But the narratives are themselves (presumably) written by men; they hardly represent a female voice (though Sivan appears at one point to imply that the latter is indirectly represented)<sup>(42)</sup>. It may be, however, that the author understands this combination of legal and narrative discourses to provide (as the title of the book and much in it suggests) a more complete account of ancient male attitudes towards male relations with other males, God and others (notably, women), and in this respect the analysis has much to commend it.

<sup>(40)</sup> It is also striking that reverence of mother as well as father is explicit in Lev 19,3, in immediate proximity to a reference to the Sabbath command: “You shall each revere his mother and his father and keep my Sabbath”.

<sup>(41)</sup> Similarly, Rebecca’s role in securing Jacob’s succession is viewed as “the exception that confirms the conventions that dictate the common terrain which situates fathers in the center, and extends beyond them to the dramas of their children” (118). But exceptions do not always prove rules; sometimes, they problematise them.

<sup>(42)</sup> She argues that even though the rhetoric of manhood may lead to a distortion of reality, “these distortions would have elicited a more accurate picture of how these women understood themselves” (228). Elsewhere, however, she maintains that “narratives hover precariously on a transcendence of the distinction between male and female” (224). In this, she takes biblical narratives as a consistent whole, at least insofar as they “project women, the idolatrous other, sinners and transgressors of laws, as potent stereotypes who induce social disorder while codes of legal morality endeavor to maintain the identity of the Israelite group”.

In this context, Sivan's readings of individual texts (leaving aside now any claims to their relationship to the Decalogue) are frequently stimulating and insightful. On occasion, she adds a comparative dimension, as where she compares the story of Joseph and the wife of Potiphar with a case from the Mari archives, arguing that adultery emerges, at least in Mesopotamia and biblical Egypt, not so much as a mode of sexual behavior as an act of betraying trust among males (163)<sup>(43)</sup>. She rightly asks (177) whether the woman suspected of adultery in the *sotah* procedure had fallen pregnant, as happened in the case of Tamar in Gen 38, and notes that if the charges proved false, there is no penalty on the man, as there was no penalty on Judah, nor is there any complementary ritual to uncover concealed male adulterers. She makes good use here of rabbinic sources in discussing the implications of the different terminology of the tenth commandment for its relationship to the eighth (189).

There is, however, plenty of scope for disagreement. I give here four examples:

(1) The boast of Lamech (Gen 4,23-24) is taken to reflect "a basic tenet of male self-perception", namely the tendency to interminable revenge, to which the legal regulations regarding asylum respond (132). Sivan does not address the view that the narrator in Gen 4 implies disapproval.

(2) Discussing the interpretation of theft as abduction, Sivan claims that "the only biblical narratives which can be construed as abduction relate to the 'theft' not of adults but of babies" (189, cf. 205). And this, despite the fact that a few pages later (191) she discusses the Jacob-Laban dispute, in which Laban actually uses the same verb (*ganav*) as that in the Decalogue to accuse Jacob of wrongly taking his daughters (Jacob's wives)<sup>(44)</sup>. Equally, she excludes the kidnapping of Joseph, on the grounds that "Joseph and his brothers are hardly a case in point since the 'crime' is 'in-house', so to speak and, in fact, the criminals are not chastised"<sup>(45)</sup>.

(3) Sivan offers a strange interpretation of what Solomon does in his judgment on the two *zonot* (and commits the common error of assuming that we know which of the women is telling the truth): "Adhering to the letter of the law, a royal verdict decreeing a fourfold restitution, for example, would have resulted in a paradoxical carving of the living baby into multiple fragments" (205)<sup>(46)</sup>. But there is no suggestion that this is the function of Solomon's order. He is not concerned to make restitution for theft, but rather to determine, by this psychological ordeal, who is the true mother of the baby, and to restore the baby (in full) to her.

<sup>(43)</sup> "Deut 22.22", she argues, "does not even hint that the man has committed a wrong against his own wife, were he married" (179). But the basic gender differentiation, here, is that man is allowed to be polygamous while woman is not allowed to be polyandrous.

<sup>(44)</sup> On the implications for family relationships of the usages of *ganav* and *gazel* in the respective speeches of Laban and Jacob, see further my *Theft in Early Jewish Law* (Oxford 1972) 7-8; *Wisdom-Laws* (Oxford 2006) 307-309.

<sup>(45)</sup> Whether only adult males are contemplated as the objects of kidnapping has, indeed, been discussed in the literature concerning Exod 21,16. But this is not discussed, Sivan preferring simply to assume that *ish* refers only to males.

<sup>(46)</sup> She adds: "Solomon's judgment, therefore, diverges significantly from the Deuteronomic ideology of a straightforward restitution for theft". In fact, Deuteronomy does not deal with theft at all, and its penalty for abduction is capital.

(4) It is hardly correct to summarise the combined effect of the two “cases” involving the daughters of Zelophehad (Num 27 and 36) as “male relatives appropriate paternal rights” (114). Even in Sivan’s terms, the real question in Exod 36 is “*which* male relatives appropriate paternal rights”. Moreover, the women do, at the very least, enjoy the property during their lifetimes, and it will descend to their children, rather than the children of their uncles, as a result of the decision in Num 27. If the objective were simply to ensure that “male relatives appropriate paternal rights”, surely the plea of the daughters in Num 27 would have failed entirely, and the brothers of Zelophehad would have inherited his estate, rather than the daughters. There is certainly a residual form of gender imbalance preserved in the story (sons exclude daughters from the inheritance, where the family includes both); nevertheless, female initiative here prompts a change in divine law.

\*  
\* \*

The introductory section of this essay distinguished three aspects of the feminist agenda: its contributions to (i) the inference of an ancient Israelite social psychology, (ii) the recovery of “authentic” (ancient) interpretations of texts, and (iii) the methodology by which we may approach such historical questions. Sivan does not in fact set out any methodological programme, and no more need here be added to the remarks in s. 2 on her methodological practice.

We may view Sivan’s formulations of the gendered character of biblical literature, as well as aspects of her discussion of the particular issues raised by the inter-relationship of laws and narratives, as an interesting contribution to the first of these objectives. Her overall claim is that “manhood is defined on the basis of demonstrative obedience to God’s precepts. Womanhood implies obedience to males and, of course, to Yahweh” (7). Female imagery emerges as “a promoter and sharer of idolatry, adultery and of loyalty/disloyalty... a swearer of false oaths... a planner of or participant in murders... an object of male violence... but also a singer of divine triumphs... a leader of Israelite armies... and an authorised seer of royal doom...”. Indeed, “...women were disturbingly amphibious (sic) creatures who were neither fully at home amid covenant men nor quite disqualified from full membership in covenant congregations. They were persons, the quintessential ‘other’, who had accumulated the attributes that the Decalogue both endorses and denounces” (223). However, while “the feminine ‘other’ takes many different forms, she always plays the same role in relation to the ideal Israelite manhood. She is a foil and necessary correlative to both positive and negative masculinity” (225).

The subtitle and structure of the book, however, indicates an emphasis on the second aspect of the agenda, the search for an “authentic” interpretation of the Decalogue. But despite a partial parallel with Philo’s use of the Decalogue to provide “headings” (*kephalaia*)<sup>(47)</sup> for the “special laws” (and, in modern times, Anthony Phillips’ *Ancient Israel’s Criminal Law. A New*

<sup>(47)</sup> *De Decalogo* 19. Cf. Sivan: “A systematic examination of the Decalogue in light of the biblical corpus of female personifications ... places at our disposal a valuable *index* for comparing Israelite entities, women and men” (224, emphasis supplied).

*Approach to the Decalogue*, to which Sivan frequently refers), it is difficult to imagine what audience within biblical times would have attempted to subsume Sivan's range of sources within an "interpretation" of the Decalogue — an interpretation which includes supplementation and reverse interpretation<sup>(48)</sup>. Such a privileging of the Decalogue appears to this reviewer to respond to a contemporary rather than an ancient agenda. True, Sivan describes it at one point as a "foundational chart" (12), but it is far from clear what historical claim, if any, is being made thereby.

Centre for Jewish Studies  
University of Manchester

Bernard S. JACKSON

<sup>(48)</sup> Thus "If interpreted in the light of the Third Commandment, Genesis 24 suggests that words uttered in God's name, regardless of gender, status and circumstances, are binding" (71).

# RECENSIONES

## Vetus Testamentum

Karl William WEYDE, *The Appointed Festivals of YHWH. The Festival Calendar in Leviticus 23 and the *sukkôt* Festival in Other Biblical Texts* (FAT 2. Reihe, 4), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004. XI + 259 p.

L'ouvrage de W. se compose de deux études successives; la première (9-144) est consacrée à une analyse détaillée du calendrier de Lévitique 23, alors que la seconde (145-236) discute de manière plus générale le rôle et la signification du festival de *sukkôt* dans la littérature exilique et postexilique. Bien qu'il s'agisse de deux études distinctes à l'origine, l'analyse de la législation de Lv 23, qui contient également une section consacrée à la célébration de *sukkôt* (v. 34-36 et 39-43), sert en quelque sorte d'introduction à la problématique plus large de la réception de cette fête après l'exil; l'articulation entre les deux parties demeure toutefois assez lâche.

L'analyse du calendrier de Lv 23 procède par le traitement successif des différentes sections qui le constituent. W. aborde de nombreuses questions de détail, mais de manière générale son étude se concentre principalement sur la question de la cohérence littéraire du ch. 23, ainsi que sur le problème des relations entre ce calendrier et les calendriers d'Ex 23,14ss.; 34,18ss. et, surtout, de Dt 16,1-17, notamment au plan de leur chronologie relative. L'auteur identifie dans la forme la plus ancienne de ce calendrier (v. 5-36, avec la parénèse des v. 37-38) une composition cohérente datant de la fin de l'époque préexilique ("late preexilic"), et qui présuppose déjà systématiquement l'ensemble des autres calendriers bibliques, ainsi que la législation "sacerdotale" de Nb 28-29 (!). Le supplément sur *sukkôt* en Lv 23,39-43 (cf. 130-142), ainsi que l'introduction du v. 2 et la section sur le sabbat au v. 3 (cf. 11-15) sont des additions ultérieures, probablement d'origine exilique (voir cependant pp. 16-17 sur la possibilité d'une datation préexilique du v. 3). La section sur la célébration de la Pâque et des Azymes en 23,5-8 (19-68) dépend à la fois de la législation prédeutéronomique en Ex 23,14ss. et 34,18ss. — dans laquelle, selon W., le lien entre Pâque et Azymes aurait déjà été établi —, de Dt 16,1-8, d'Ex 12-13 et de Nb 28,16-25 (on notera au passage que W. considère Dt 16,5-8 comme plus tardif que les v. 1-4, qui représenteraient la législation de base). La législation sur la célébration de la nouvelle récolte aux v. 10-22 (69-88) reprend non seulement Ex 23,16; 34,22; Dt 16,9-12 et Nb 28,26-31, mais s'inspire en outre selon W. de Dt 26,1ss. et de Lv 2,11-12. La fête des *kippurîm* (v. 27-32) dépend de Nb 29,7-11 et de Lv 16,29-31, mais aussi d'Ex 12,14-20 (92-112). Enfin, la section sur la célébration de *sukkôt* (v. 34-36) réinterprète Dt 16,13-15 en transférant la prescription de tenir une



assemblée solennelle du septième jour de la fête des Azymes (Dt 16,8) au huitième et dernier jour de la fête des Tentes (cf. Lv 23,36), comme déjà en Nb 29,35-36 (112-130); selon W., ce développement reflète vraisemblablement l'importance croissante de la fête de *sukkôt*. Sur la base des autres témoignages bibliques de la fête des Tentes (en particulier Za 14,16ss.; Ps 81,4; Ne 9 et Dt 31,9ss.), W. postule qu'à l'époque de la rédaction de Lv 23 cette fête, et tout particulièrement le rassemblement cultuel du huitième jour, incluait probablement déjà une commémoration de l'exode et une lecture de la Loi, bien que le lien avec l'exode ne soit explicitement développé que dans le supplément formé par les v. 39-43.

Dans la seconde partie du livre, l'étude du développement de *sukkôt* aux époques exilique et postexilique se compose de trois chapitres. Le premier analyse le récit de la dédicace du Temple par Salomon en 1 R 8 (147-162), que W. attribue *in toto* à l'"auteur deutéronomiste", en lien avec la célébration de la fête du septième mois mentionnée aux v. 2 et 65. Le lien ainsi établi entre la troisième fête de pèlerinage de l'année et la dédicace du Temple servirait à souligner, pour Dtr, que l'exode a atteint son but avec la construction du Temple, comme le suggère déjà la notice de 1 R 6,1, et à légitimer le Temple salomonien en le présentant comme l'"héritier" direct du Tabernacle d'Ex. Le second chapitre (163-209) traite du rapport entre la fête des Tentes et les Psaumes; à la suite de M.S. Smith, en particulier, W. reprend l'hypothèse classique de Mowinckel selon laquelle les Psaumes dits du "Règne" ou de la "Royauté de Yhwh" (Ps 93; 95-100) auraient été composés pour la célébration de *sukkôt*. Ce contexte cultuel vaut probablement aussi pour le Ps 81 et, peut-être, pour les Ps 29; 50; 65; 68 et 118. La mise en rapport de ces psaumes avec la fête de *sukkôt* témoignerait ainsi du développement, à l'époque postexilique, d'une tradition d'interprétation associant cette fête avec le règne universel de Yhwh sur la création, manifesté notamment à travers ses interventions salvifiques pour son peuple et, dans le futur, pour toutes les nations. Cette tradition se reflète notamment dans la conclusion de Za 9-14: 14,16-21, à laquelle W. consacre son dernier chapitre (210-236). Dans cette prophétie, qui témoigne de l'importance croissante de la fête de *sukkôt* à l'époque postexilique, cette célébration est désormais explicitement mise en lien avec la reconnaissance de la royauté de Yhwh par tous les peuples de la terre qui auront survécu à la bataille cosmique décrite au début du ch. 14. W. suggère de voir essentiellement dans ce texte la réception combinée de la représentation de la royauté universelle de Yhwh telle qu'on la trouve non seulement dans les Psaumes du Règne mais déjà en 1 R 8,41-43, d'une part, et du motif du pèlerinage des nations à Jérusalem dans les "Psaumes de Sion" et dans certains textes prophétiques d'autre part. En outre, la mise en relation en Za 14,16-21 de la célébration de *sukkôt* avec la perspective d'une restauration radicale, sinon eschatologique (voir sur ce point la discussion, pp. 233-235), doit être comprise sur l'arrière-plan de la tradition établie par les récits de 1 R 8; Esd 3,3ss. et Ne 8,13ss., qui, déjà, "connect in some way or another this festival to the idea of inauguration" (234).

L'ouvrage de W. a le mérite d'offrir un parcours intéressant du festival de *sukkôt* dans la tradition biblique, depuis ses plus anciennes attestations jusqu'aux plus récentes; en ce sens, il doit être consulté par tous ceux qui s'intéressent à l'histoire de ce festival. Néanmoins, son approche soulève de

nombreux problèmes, notamment d'ordre méthodologique, qui font qu'il est souvent difficile, sinon impossible, de suivre W. dans ses conclusions. Sa lecture de la fonction de la référence à *sukkôt* en 1 R 8 comme "marqueur chronologique" de la fin de l'exode est intéressante, mais l'attribution de l'ensemble de ce chapitre à une même main dtr est invraisemblable, et semble ignorer tout à fait la discussion sur ce texte. En particulier, les v. qui font référence à la fête (v. 2 et 65-66) sont souvent considérés en raison de leur langage et de leur contenu comme relevant non pas d'une rédaction dtr, mais d'une relecture "sacerdotale" tardive du récit de la dédicace du Temple par Salomon en 1 R 8,1-11 et 62-66, déjà proche de la théologie des Chroniques. La prise en compte par W. de ce résultat de la recherche lui aurait permis de situer ses observations dans un tout autre horizon, celui d'une édition tardive de Jos-2 R par les milieux du second Temple à Jérusalem cherchant apparemment, par différentes interventions ponctuelles dans les Prophètes antérieurs, à relire l'histoire des origines d'Israël en Ex-R dans une perspective liturgique et cultuelle. Le traitement des Psaumes tient mieux compte de l'état de la recherche, et discute de manière détaillée les positions de plusieurs auteurs récents. Néanmoins, la mise en relation des Psaumes du Règne avec la célébration de *sukkôt* demeure largement hypothétique, et ne se fonde que sur l'observation des parallèles thématiques avec Za 14,9.16-21 (cf. 172-175; voir également 221-224). Bien que la possibilité d'un usage liturgique de certains Ps ne puisse être exclue *a priori*, W. observe lui-même que cette thèse ne va guère dans le sens de la recherche actuelle, qui voit dans les Ps essentiellement des œuvres *littéraires* (cf. E. Zenger *et al.*). De ce point de vue, la question du lien des Psaumes du Règne avec leur contexte socio-historique et les traditions religieuses de l'époque de leur composition ne saurait être simplement réduite à la problématique classique de l'identification du *Sitz im Leben*, comme W. tend encore à le faire systématiquement, bien qu'il soit conscient, par ailleurs, des problèmes que soulève l'approche de Mowinckel. Même s'il est vrai que l'on trouve occasionnellement dans les Psaumes une référence aux temps forts de l'année liturgique au Temple de Jérusalem (cf. par exemple Ps 81,4, auquel W. consacre une longue discussion, 176ss.), cette observation ne prouve encore nullement que ces Ps ont nécessairement été composés pour un usage liturgique; en outre, dans le cas des Psaumes du Règne l'absence de toute référence explicite à un festival spécifique rend l'hypothèse d'un usage liturgique particulièrement problématique. Dans le cas de Za 14,16-21, l'analyse par W. des sources de ce texte est intéressante et permet d'éclairer la signification de la référence à *sukkôt* dans le contexte de Za 9-14. Cependant, on aurait souhaité que W. n'en reste pas à une approche strictement intertextuelle, et intègre quelques considérations sur la date de composition et le milieu de production de Za 9-14 qui lui auraient permis de mieux marquer la singularité de ce texte dans l'histoire de la réception de *sukkôt*, et d'éviter de donner l'impression que l'oracle de Za 14,16-21 serait le résultat d'une évolution exclusivement littéraire et presque naturelle. Enfin, même si, dans un premier temps de l'analyse et du point de vue chronologique, W. a raison de maintenir une distinction entre sources bibliques et post-bibliques, l'histoire de la réception de *sukkôt* à l'époque postexilique aurait été utilement complétée par un chapitre sur le rôle et la signification de *sukkôt* dans la littérature juive des

premiers siècles avant notre ère, qui aurait notamment permis d'inscrire la tendance esquissée par W. dans le développement de cette fête dans un cadre plus large et plus rigoureux (voir notamment H. Ulfsgard).

Néanmoins, c'est surtout la première partie de cette étude qui soulève d'importantes difficultés. Outre que W. traite la question de l'origine du calendrier de Lv 23 en dehors de toute considération sur la composition du code de sainteté, qui a fait l'objet d'une importante discussion ces dernières années, sa tentative visant à démontrer que Lv 23 est le calendrier le plus tardif au sein de la Torah est tout à fait problématique. Pour parvenir à ce résultat, W. combine des hypothèses de recherche qui en réalité sont difficilement conciliables. D'une part, il accepte — à mon sens à juste titre — la thèse classique selon laquelle Lv 23 dépend déjà de Dt 16,1-17, comme l'ont réaffirmé A. Cholewinski, E. Otto et K. Grünwaldt. D'un autre côté, cependant, W. adopte l'hypothèse défendue par I. Knohl et J. Milgrom pour qui le calendrier de Lv 23, dans sa version initiale, est *antérieur* à Dt 16, mais néanmoins postérieur au calendrier sacerdotal de Nb 28–29, l'auteur du code de sainteté (H) en Lv 17-26 (27) étant pour eux déjà l'éditeur de P. Au lieu de la séquence classique D, H, P (A. Kuenen, J. Wellhausen), ou de la séquence inverse chez Knohl et Milgrom (P, H, D), W. défend ainsi *de facto* pour Lv 23 une séquence P, D, H, même si ce modèle n'est guère explicité dans son analyse. Sur le plan exégétique, l'hypothèse de la dépendance de Lv 23 à l'égard de Nb 28–29 reste toutefois entièrement contestable. Les arguments individuels avancés par W., qui reprend largement sur ce point les observations de Knohl et de Milgrom, pour la priorité chronologique de Nb 28–29 peuvent le plus souvent être retournés, comme W. le reconnaît d'ailleurs explicitement lui-même dans sa discussion de Lv 23,5-8 (voir 27-28), et la démonstration repose à plusieurs reprises sur des principes qui ne sont pas entièrement cohérents. En particulier, lorsque Lv 23 est plus imprécis que Nb 28–29, W. y voit la preuve que le premier calendrier présuppose le second, alors que lorsque la situation inverse se présente, W. en déduit que Lv 23 complète et spécifie Nb 28–29, et représente par conséquent déjà un développement plus tardif. Il resterait également à expliquer comment, dans ce modèle, il convient d'interpréter le calendrier de Dt 16 qui, comme on l'a observé traditionnellement, développe clairement les calendriers d'Ex 23 (et peut-être d'Ex 34 dans une première version, mais cette question est disputée), mais semble clairement tout ignorer de Nb 28–29; là encore, la thèse de la priorité chronologique de ce dernier calendrier semble difficile à maintenir. De manière générale, W. (tout comme déjà Knohl et Milgrom avant lui) ignore totalement le problème de la chronologie relative de Nb 28–29 au sein de la tradition sacerdotale. Ces chapitres sont traditionnellement considérés comme une insertion très tardive, et le débat récent sur P, notamment sur la fin de Pg, a largement démontré que l'ensemble des textes soi-disant "sacerdotaux" en Nb relèvent en réalité d'une rédaction beaucoup plus tardive que l'écrit sacerdotal primitif. On notera en outre sur ce point que l'adoption par W. de la thèse de la priorité chronologique de Nb 28–29 sur Lv 23 le conduit à une véritable impasse, puisqu'elle implique logiquement une datation préexilique (et même pré-deutéronomique) de "P", une solution dont W. reconnaît toutefois — ici encore, à juste titre — qu'elle est problématique (ainsi explicitement p. 39, n. 51). La question (légitime) de

savoir comment il est possible d'harmoniser ces deux conclusions reste sans véritable réponse dans l'étude de W., qui postule tout au plus l'existence d'"early levels of the Priestly traditions" (51). Par-dessus tout, la tentative de W. de concilier l'hypothèse d'une datation post-D, mais néanmoins préexilique, de Lv 23 avec celle de la dépendance de ce calendrier à l'égard de Nb 28–29 passe complètement à côté du fait que l'argumentation de Knohl et de Milgrom pour une datation préexilique de P et de H repose, au contraire, *sur la théorie selon laquelle ces deux législations sont nécessairement antérieures à la législation deutéronomique*. Ainsi — pour ne mentionner qu'un exemple — l'hypothèse selon laquelle le code de sainteté en général, et Lv 23 en particulier, présupposeraient encore une pluralité de lieux de culte, que W. reprend systématiquement à son compte dans sa justification d'une datation préexilique de Lv 23, n'a guère de sens si la rédaction de ce calendrier suit immédiatement la législation deutéronomique et la centralisation du culte, comme il le défend. Enfin, la critique littéraire de Lv 23 (où là encore, W. suit largement Milgrom) laisse également de nombreuses questions ouvertes, tout particulièrement en ce qui concerne le rapport entre le calendrier primitif de Lv 23 et l'ensemble de H. De manière générale W. tend à traiter ce calendrier comme une tradition indépendante à l'origine, même s'il ne se prononce jamais clairement sur ce point; mais dans ce cas, W. aurait dû au moins offrir une discussion du cadre rédactionnel (v. 1-2), et surtout des nombreux parallèles entre ce chapitre et son contexte littéraire. Dans cette perspective, on observera aussi que l'élimination de l'instruction sur le sabbat au v. 3, nécessaire à W. comme à Milgrom pour maintenir l'hypothèse d'une datation préexilique de Lv 23, est problématique au vu de l'importance de ce motif à la fois dans ce chapitre et, plus généralement, dans le reste de Lv 17–26 (Lv 19,3.30; 26,2; et surtout Lv 25!).

Université de Lausanne  
Suisse

Christophe NIHAN

Gary N. KNOPPERS, *I Chronicles 1-9. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 12). New York, Doubleday 2004. xxii-514 p. 16 × 24. \$49.95 – Can\$69.95

Gary N. KNOPPERS, *I Chronicles 10-29. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 12A). New York, Doubleday 2004. xxii p., pp. 515-1045. 16 × 24. \$49.95 – Can\$69.95

Forty years ago, Jacob Myers published a one-volume commentary on 1 Chronicles in the Anchor Bible series (J.M. Myers, *I Chronicles. Introduction, Translation, and Notes* [AB 12; New York 1965]). Last year saw the publication of a two-volume commentary on 1 Chronicles in the same series by Gary N. Knoppers, Head of the Department of Classics and Ancient Mediterranean Studies at Pennsylvania State University.

Knoppers has done a tremendous job. Even on a superficial view one can ascertain that in recent decades the study of the Book of Chronicles has made

enormous progress. On the one hand this is due to the recent conviction that the archaeological finds from the Persian period are much more plentiful and better analyzed than they were a few decades ago. On the other hand, there is also more agreement among scholars that the Persian and Hellenistic periods are much more important in the editing of the Hebrew Scriptures than earlier generations had imagined.

In more than one thousand pages, Knoppers has succeeded in presenting to his readers a circumstantial and thorough explanation of the First Book of Chronicles, a document that has been, and still is, frequently disputed or put aside because of the humdrum genealogies at the opening (I Chronicles 1–9). The mere fact that the entire first volume of this new commentary is dedicated to these genealogies is solid proof enough that they should be considered an important and indispensable part of the entire document.

The commentary opens (1–43) with a fresh translation of 1 Chronicles, followed by a substantial Introduction (47–137), in which nearly all topics to be expected are dealt with. They include: the titles of the book; the relevance of textual criticism; the Chronicler's use of earlier biblical books; the state of recent studies on Chronicles; theories of multiple editions; the debate over authorship and date; the issue of extra-biblical sources; is Chronicles to be considered a rewritten Bible?; Chronicles and canon. It is a pity that a section on the major themes and theology of Chronicles will not appear until the introduction to the second volume.

That the study of the Book of Chronicles has made serious progress in recent decades can, among other indications, be demonstrated with the help of the bibliography. Whereas Myers' 'Selected bibliography' filled only three and a half pages (xci–xciv), Knoppers' bibliography numbers exactly one hundred (141–241). It strikes the eye, however, that the table of 'Contents' (viii) says 'Bibliography', whereas the actual heading reads 'Select Bibliography' (141). The author does not indicate whether this Bibliography is meant to cover only 1 Chronicles, or that it already includes 2 Chronicles as well.

The commentary itself (245–966) consists of 36 sections, the majority of which have the same structure: translation; textual notes; notes; sources and composition; comment. In only a few instances an extra paragraph has been added, such as 'structure' (1,1–2,2; 5,27–41; 20,1–8), and 'form and structure' (5,1–26).

In both volumes an identical set of eight maps has been included. The first map, entitled 'The Province of Yehud in Persian Period Syria-Palestine', is quite revealing, since it reflects the author's attitude to the date of the Book of Chronicles: the late fourth or early third Century B.C.E. This point of view is amply discussed in the Introduction: 'The Debate over Authorship and Date' (101–117).

At the end of the second volume one finds four Indices: Biblical References (975–1007); Ancient Text References (1009–1012); Modern Authors (1013–1022); Subjects (1023–1045). In sum: the reader is not only treated to a robust piece of work, but also to a true goldmine of excellent scholarly results.

Following this swift general presentation of the commentary, some observations and remarks are in order now. Knoppers is providing his readers

with solid arguments to disconnect 1–2 Chronicles from Ezra–Nehemiah and to postulate different authors for each of the two. In the debate over the doublet in 2 Chron 36,22–23 and Ezra 1,1–3a, Knoppers' remarks relating to the position of 1 Ezra are of great importance.

On the methodological level, Knoppers is to be thanked for a number of things:

- As far as authorship is concerned, he not only postulates a single author for 1–2 Chronicles, but also takes the position that one should not too soon accept the label 'secondary addition(s)', as has so easily been done both in the past and even in recent time.

- Time after time Knoppers demonstrates that scholars have expended considerable effort attempting to reconstruct the editorial history of a passage, but that they have devoted remarkably little attention to its organisation and context. He instead offers good insights and solid arguments for studying just these issues.

- In respect of textual criticism, Knoppers not only in the Introduction (52–65), but also repeatedly when discussing particular text-critical problems and the so-called 'synoptic passages' is emphasizing that one has to be very cautious about too easily supposing direct interrelationship or dependence between text traditions and versions. As has now been witnessed by the Dead Sea Scrolls, the author(s) of 1–2 Chronicles used a Hebrew text of 1–2 Samuel that was a different text type from the Masoretic Text of 1–2 Samuel we have and as matter of fact is closer to 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the Greek translation of 1–2 Samuel. The Masoretic Text of 1–2 Kings, on the other hand, is quite close to the Hebrew text of 1–2 Chronicles. Knoppers' caution in attributing tendentious intentions to a Chronicles text whenever it differs from other biblical texts results in presenting in a careful way the plentiful and rich textual notes at the opening of each section. 'Employing the insights gained by text-critical studies of the Chronicler's sources affords scholars greater control over the available data and, hence, more precision and accuracy in determining the compositional technique and ideology of the Chronicler' (71).

The paragraphs entitled 'Notes' are a precious deposit of all kinds of information relating to names, words, specific collocations, etc. and their distribution both over the Hebrew Bible and within the Book of Chronicles. The rubrics 'Sources' offer an overview of what biblical passages have been adopted or reworked by the Chronicler and in what way; Knoppers is quite reserved with respect to extra-biblical sources. As a standard procedure, the composition of the Chronicler's text is studied.

In the section 'Comment' Knoppers all the time offers excellent and well-organized summaries of positions taken by other scholars. At the end of such outlines he usually presents his own point of view, which not only is well-weighed, but many times has some new and attractive aspects. Such appealing pieces of research come to light, e.g., in Knoppers' discussion of the sources, composition, and structure of 1 Chron 6,39–66 (443–450) or in the Excursus on the composition of 1 Chronicles 23–27 (788–789). The only other Excursus ('The Genealogies', 245–265) in fact is the opening of the commentary section and is a very instructive introduction to the first part of 1 Chronicles. Here, as well in many other instances in the commentary, one



is struck by the wide knowledge Knoppers displays with regard to (parallels between) the Judean and the Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern cultures.

Finally, some critical remarks are in order:

– Nowhere in this two-volume commentary on 1 Chronicles does Knoppers have a paragraph relating to the overall structure of the Book of Chronicles. We only have the headings in the 'Contents' to provide an answer to this question, as far as 1 Chronicles is concerned: 1. The Genealogical Introduction to the People of Israel (1,1–9,34); 2. The Reign of Israel's First King (9,35–10,14); 3. The Rise and Reign of David (11,1–29,30).

– It is a pity that the commentary has only a general bibliography. A detailed bibliography to every passage under discussion is enormously missed. With respect to 1 Chron 20,4–8, e.g., none of the following publications has been included in the bibliography: C.E. Heux, «The *yelîdê hārāpa*' - A Cultic Association of Warriors», *BASOR* 221 (1976) 83–85; W. Horwitz, «The Significance of the Rephaim», *JNSL* 7 (1979) 37–43; L.M. von Pákozdy, «Elchanan - Der frühere Name Davids?», *ZAW* 68 (1956) 257–259; H. Rouillard, «Rephaim», in *DDD*, 1307–1324; Y. Yadin, «Goliath's Javelin and the *m'nôr 'ôr'gîm*», *PEQ* 87 (1955) 58–69. The same is true relating to 1 Chron 26,18 (G. Toloni, «A Proposito di *parwār / parbār*», *AION* 56 [1996] 441–457; id., «Ulteriori osservazioni sul significato di *parbār* (1 Cr 26,18b) alla luce di alcune versioni arabe», *Sefarad* 58 [1998] 379–386) and to 1 Chronicles 29 (D. Phillips, «The Importance of the Pesjitta in Syriac Tradition: The Example of the Pesjitta to 1 Chronicles 29», *The Harp* 5 [1992] 67–91).

It is beyond any doubt that Knoppers elicits admiration, not only for his perseverance publishing such a lengthy, two-volume commentary on 1 Chronicles, but also because of his high-class expertise, especially in the field of textual criticism and literary analysis. He is also to be thanked for having offered excellent insights into previous scholarly discussions relating to difficult and/or important questions, always adding his own reasoned point of view. There can be no question that this commentary has set the tone for decades to come.

Slotlaan 437  
NL-3701 GZ Zeist

Pancratius C. BEENTJES

Martin NEHER, *Wesen und Wirken der Weisheit in der Sapientia Salomonis* (BZAW 333). Berlin – New York, Walter de Gruyter, 2004. x-274 p. 16 × 23,5.

This work by M. Neher is offered as the publication of the author's Dissertation presented in the Phillips-Universität of Marburg under the supervision of Otto Kaiser and Jörg Jeremias. The introduction (1–18) clarifies the aim of the research: it is a question of enquiring whether the figure of personified wisdom, present in the central chapters of the Book of Wis-



dom (especially in Wis 7–10), ought to be considered as an hypostasis or rather a personification of a poetic nature (“Findet sich bereits in der Sapientia Salomonis ein hypostasiertes Verständnis der Weisheit oder handelt es sich bei ihren personifizierten Beschreibungen lediglich um poetische Metaphern?”, 7). Pages 8–17 are, therefore, devoted to the search for a definition of ‘hypostasis’ with which to work. Neher notes the difficulty of finding a definition of hypostasis that does not risk emphasising too one-sidedly either the ontological aspect (“Wesen”) or the functional one (“Wirken”).

The first main section of the book (18–154) is dedicated to a “traditions-geschichtliche Analyse” of the biblical texts in which the figure of personified wisdom appears, that is Prov 1–9, Job 28, Sir 1,1–10 and 24 (texts to which I believe Bar 3,9–4,4 could be added), followed finally by the texts of the Book of Wisdom which form the body of Neher’s work.

The analysis of the first speech of personified Wisdom in Prov 1,20–33 (20–32) leads Neher to a first conclusion: that the personification of wisdom is none other than a “poetische Stilmittel” (31) and that the message of wisdom contains “keine ontologischen Aussagen” (ib.). Neher then analyses with some care the text of Prov 8 (32–52), concentrating, above all, as is logical, on Prov 8,22–31. He reads, in particular, the difficult *qananî* of Prov 8,22 in the sense of ‘create’ and the still more discussed *’amôn* of Prov 8,30 as referring to God (“Werkmeister”) and not to wisdom, Neher claims that, in so far as it is described as a creature of God, the personified wisdom of Prov 8 can in no way be considered an hypostasis; it is a question simply of a poetic personification. He comes to the same conclusion at the end of the briefer analysis of Prov 9,1–18 (53–58). Neher adds (59) that in Prov 1–9 both ‘Lady Wisdom’ and ‘Dame Folly’ have an allegorical character.

From the Book of Proverbs, Neher goes on to analyse the text of Job 28 (60–70). We should note first of all how Neher excludes vv. 3c, 4c, 15–19 and 28, considered to be secondary, thus dividing the text into two strophes: vv. 1–11\* and vv. 12–27\*. In Job 28 too wisdom is described as a creature; in fact the verbal form *hēkînah* in Job 28,27b is translated as ‘create’. But v. 27 likewise shows, according to Neher, how the essence and the works of wisdom are not something concrete; wisdom is not an independent reality, or an hypostasis but refers directly to God (69).

The last two texts dealt with by Neher before going on to the Book of Wisdom are Sir 1,1–10 and Sir 24 (71–88). Although Ben Sirach is in touch with Hellenistic culture, he does not ask himself about the essence of wisdom but connects it closely with the Law (“Die Weisheit ist das Gesetz Gottes”, 233); according to Sir 24,23–29, in particular, it is not so much wisdom that leads to the Law as that obedience to the commandments leads to wisdom. But it is precisely this narrow connection between wisdom and the Law which prevents us from thinking of wisdom as a separate essence, as an entity with its own autonomy.

At this point, the author moves to consider the texts of the Book of Wisdom, of which he comments in particular on Wis 1,1–10 (89–98); 7,1–14 (98–107); 7,15–8,1 (107–120); 9,1–18 (121–134) and, finally, Wis 10,1–11,1 (134–151). Each text is presented with a translation furnished with ample textual notes, a brief comment on the literary structure and a broader

exegetical commentary focused on the basic theme of the entire study: the essence and the works of wisdom. In the initial text of Wis 1,1-10 wisdom is presented as a link (“Bindenglied”, 98) between God and men and its essence is capable of being described as ‘spirit.’ This identification between wisdom and spirit, in the light of the texts of Wis 7,1-8,1 has a double function for Neher (119): to show the divine aspect of wisdom and to prevent a direct identification of it with God. Wisdom assumes thus a mediating role between God and men. There then arises again the question whether wisdom is to be considered an hypostasis or rather a personification of a poetic nature (120).

The long analysis of Wis 9 and 10 is aimed at answering such a question. The identification between wisdom and spirit, in particular (cf. 9,17), reveals once more how wisdom cannot be considered an hypostasis (cf. the lapidary conclusion of p. 154), but rather a way of describing the deeds and wonders of God in the history of Israel, helping thus to emphasise at one and the same time the divine transcendence and immanence.

The third chapter, actually too short (155-163), is devoted to the different way in which Philo who, according to Neher, was aware of the Book of Wisdom, resolves the problem of mediation (“Vermittlung”), by introducing the concept of hypostasis. The consideration of Philo opens the fourth and last part of the book, dedicated to the theme of Greek influence on the Book of Wisdom (163-228); we thus face one of the problems relating to the Book of Wisdom most discussed at present. An initial *status quaestionis* brings already a first conclusion: the authors agree in maintaining that the Book of Wisdom does not follow any particular philosophical system, but appears rather as an eclectic work. There is a discussion on the philosophical system which would have influenced him the most, and on whether such influence is to be regarded only on the terminological level or if it is to be placed deeper.

Neher considers that, as far as the theme of the mediation between God and men is concerned, the most fruitful area of study, in relation to the texts of the Book of Wisdom, is that of the so-called ‘*panenpneumatism*’ of the Stoics because it now seems clear that the author of Wisdom would have known the Stoic doctrine of the *pneuma*. The first author introduced is Posidonius of Apamea (186-202), connected for some time with the Book of Wisdom. But Posidonius makes such a narrow identification between reality and God (while the author of Wisdom makes a clear-cut distinction between creature and Creator) that it is impossible to think that he could be the inspiration of the Book of Wisdom, particularly with regard to the problem of mediation (202). It is worth recalling that C. Larcher (*Études sur le livre de la Sagesse* [Paris 1969] 224-226) had already dealt with the subject and come to not dissimilar conclusions. The second author brought forward is Antiochus of Ascalon (203-217), who is interesting for his original way of taking up the Platonic doctrine of the ideas in a Stoicising context. But while Antiochus binds this teaching of his to the problem of knowledge, the wisdom offered in the book of that name is not so much described Platonically as an ‘idea’ as rather something bound up with justice and “the fearing of God.” The third and last author studied (218-226) is Eudorus of Alexandria, a representative of Middle Platonism who, in reality, serves only to show how much the problem of mediation was debated in Alexandria in the first century BC. In no way is it possible to find a philosophic ‘source’ for the Book of Wisdom as far

as the problem of mediation is concerned (227-228). The author of the Book of Wisdom is to be seen “als philosophisch gebildeten jüdischen Theologen” (228), who, although he certainly makes use of the contemporary philosophical vocabulary, provides his own original response to the problem of mediation discussed in Alexandria. Neher’s conclusion is again the same: the description of wisdom is to be considered as poetic; in no way do we find ourselves encountering an hypostasis (228); the wise author of the Book of Wisdom remains faithful to the Biblical tradition (239-240), even when he makes use of philosophic language.

Neher’s conclusion seems interesting to me for two kinds of reason: first of all, because it appears to clarify the discussion about the nature of wisdom within the sapiential tradition of Israel, definitively excluding the idea of the hypostasis (still maintained by authors like Winston). In the second place, because it helps us to understand better the relation of the Book of Wisdom with the philosophy of its time; our author seems in fact not to follow any particular philosophic system although at the same time he shows himself to be *au fait* with the debates of his time and shows himself capable of using the language of philosophy. Particularly interesting are the two sections devoted to Antiochus of Ascalon and Eudorus of Alexandria, even if not entirely new: cf. in fact again Larcher, *Études sur le livre de la Sagesse*, 202, (n. 6), 231, 234.

A critical evaluation of the work of Neher must, however, take account first of all of the fact that the author devotes a quite disproportionate amount of space to the question of the hypostasis, as far as the figure of Wisdom in that book is concerned. The subject, in fact, has already been well tackled by the above-mentioned C. Larcher in his famous *Études sur le livre de la Sagesse*: Larcher already discussed — and excluded — the hypostatic hypothesis (cf especially pp. 398-402 of which Neher seems to be unaware). It is also true that Larcher states that the variety of opinions on the subject “n’autorise guère l’espoir d’aboutir à une solution pleinement satisfaisante” (*Études*, 402). However, his own rejection of the idea of the hypothesis seems very convincing. According to Larcher, wisdom is personified “à titre d’expression adéquate de l’agir de Dieu dans le monde et des attributs qui impègnent cet agir” (*Études*, 409). The refutation of the hypostatic solution has been confirmed more recently by M. Gilbert (“Sagesse de Salomon”, *DBS* XI [Paris 1986] 108), an author of whom Neher consistently shows himself to be unaware (apart from only two citations in the final bibliography on p. 248, neither of which is relevant to the theme in question). Gilbert makes it clear how if, on the one hand, the hypostatic hypothesis is not convincing, it does not seem possible to reduce wisdom to a simple poetic personification either, as Neher seems many times to suggest, and not only *à propos* of the Book of Wisdom.

It seems to me, therefore, that beyond nailing down a problematic identification (wisdom as hypostasis) Neher’s work is over-hasty in watering down the figure of wisdom to a simple poetic personification. The question is certainly complex, but the studies on personified wisdom, beginning with those relating to Prov 1–9, reveal a tendency to consider such wisdom as something more than a simple literary device. As far the Book of Wisdom in particular is concerned, if the theological problem underlying the figure of

wisdom personified is certainly that of mediation, such personification “sert à exprimer l’action de Dieu dans le monde, sa presence à l’univers, à l’homme et en particulier aux justes” (Gilbert, *ib.*; cf also the conclusions weighing slightly more in favour of the hypostasis in J. Vílchez Líndez, *Sapienza* [Rome 1990] 95-97, an author of whom Neher is equally unaware). For this reason, it does not appear to me to be sufficient to demonstrate that wisdom is not an hypostasis; it would have been necessary to investigate its characteristics thoroughly, in particular, as far as Wis 7-9 is concerned, its cosmic role, the action of wisdom in man, the connection of wisdom with the word and with education. More especially, it would have been necessary to examine deeply the double axis with which wisdom is presented in the homonymous book: that of the link with God, that is to say the axis of transcendence (see, for example, the link between wisdom and spirit) and that of the link with the cosmos, the axis of immanence (see, for example, the role of wisdom in the creation and the fundamental educational role of wisdom). The axis of transcendence prevents the author of the Book of Wisdom from falling into a typically Stoic pantheism; the axis of immanence, on the other hand, prevents wisdom from being considered as a purely poetic representation of a divine quality. It would seem to us reasonable, therefore, that the contact with the Hellenistic world is certainly very profound and that the use of the vocabulary and philosophical concepts within the Book of Wisdom is something that makes it more than a work of propaganda or a clarification of typically Jewish positions (cf. Neher, 228), even if it is possible to maintain, with Neher, that our sage does not follow any particular philosophical current nor seems to have been influenced by a specific author.

Other aspects of Neher’s book would require a further critical evaluation. I note, for example, how, in the analysis of biblical texts, Neher shows a constant tendency to put between parentheses many passages considered spurious or secondary: this happens in Prov 1,22bc.27c; Prov 8,13a.34; 9,7-12; Job 28,3c.4c.15-19.28; Sir 1,5.7; 24,18.22c.24; Wis 9,15. Some of these passages (Prov 8,13a, for example) undoubtedly fall within this class. For others, however, Neher’s choice is unquestionably controversial; on Prov 9,7-12, the discussion is in fact open (cf. B.K. Waltke, *The Book of Proverbs* [NICOT; Michigan-Cambridge 2004] 438-439); on Job 28,28 cf., for example, G. Borgonovo, *La notte e il suo sole* (AnBib 135; Rome 1992) 263, n. 53 and N. Habel, *The Book of Job* (OTL; Philadelphia 1985) 400-401. On the additions in Sir 24, cf. an excellent analysis of the problem in M. Gilbert, “Les additions grecques et latines à Siracide 24”, *Lectures et relectures de la Bible* (ed. J. M. Auwers – A. Wénin) (BETL 144; Leuven 1999) 195-207. As far as Wis 9,15 is concerned, it is totally unfounded to consider v. 15 as redactional simply because it seems to display clear Platonic influence (thus Neher, 131, n. 170).

Some more detailed observations: in studying the text of the Book of Wisdom, Neher seems to be unaware of the results of the literary analysis of P. Bizetti (never cited; cf. his *Il libro della Sapienza. Struttura e genere letterario* [Brescia 1984]) and M. Gilbert (*vide supra*); an example of this ignorance is the analysis of Wis 1,1-10 which does not take into account the fact that the literary unity is obviously 1,1-15 (90); also Wis 11,1 as belonging to the preceding section (136) is far from being accepted. Even though cited

in the final bibliography, the very detailed commentaries by Larcher and Scarpat are hardly used; in particular, Neher shows that he does not know of the huge mound of material recommended by Scarpat in his second volume (*Libro della Sapienza*, II [Biblica. Studi e Tesi 3; Brescia 1996]), an absolutely fundamental text which, significantly, Neher does not even mention in his final bibliography.

Via Corridoni 5  
50134 Firenze

Luca MAZZINGHI

Víctor MORLA, *Lamentaciones* (Nueva Biblia Española: Poesía).  
Estella (Navarra), Editorial Verbo Divino, 2004. 500 p. 16 × 23,5.  
€ 29.81

Dieser große Kommentar zu den Klageliedern schließt eine schmerzliche Lücke im exegetisch-theologischen Angebot, denn außer den beiden Sammelkommentaren, die andere biblische Bücher mitberücksichtigen (J.M. Abrego, 1992; L. Alonso Schökel, 1976) und der thematisch angelegten Monographie von J.A. Mayoral, *Sufrimiento y esperanza. La crisis exílica en Lamentaciones* (ABE 29; Estella 1994), gab es bislang keine entsprechende Kommentierung dieses Buches in Spanischer Sprache. Er wird über die Iberische Halbinsel hinaus viel Beachtung in Süd – und Mittelamerika finden, und darüber hinaus auf dem sich immer stärker ausweitenden hispanischen Markt in den Vereinigten Staaten. Der Autor, geboren 1943, Professor für mittelalterliche Philologie und den klassischen Sprachen an der Universität von Deusto war für diese Aufgabe nach seinen Kommentierungen der Sprichwörter (1992), Ben Sirachs (1992), der Weisheitsbücher (1994) und des Hohenliedes (2004) mehr als prädestiniert.

Zu Beginn steht eine informative, wenn auch nicht ganz umfassende Einleitung zu den Klageliedern (19-57). Die Ausführungen zu Autor, Name und Zeit (19-23) fallen besonders kurz aus, zumal sich der Autor nicht auf hypothetische Spekulationen einlassen will. Doch teilt er die Ansicht der meisten heutigen Ausleger, die nicht von einem Autor, sondern von einer Autorengruppe ausgehen, die sich des Themas vom Untergang Jerusalems in dichterisch-dramatischer Form annahm. Die jeremianische Autorschaft gehört demnach in die Geschichte der Auslegung und ist kein Element der eigentlichen Textauslegung mehr.

Die literarischen Merkmale der Klgl werden ausführlicher behandelt (24-37), wobei das Hauptaugenmerk auf der Analyse der Aktanten und der Personifikation Jerusalems und Zions liegt. Der Überblick über die Semantik der Klage und des Schmerzes fällt besonders gelungen aus, zumal sich hier die reiche Erfahrung des Autors bei der redaktionellen Mitverantwortung des *Diccionario bíblico hebreo-español* (Madrid 1994) positiv auswirkt. Die Stärke dieses Kommentars liegt überhaupt in der semantischen Analyse mit einem gelungenen Blick auf die Zielsprache. Das starke philologische Interesse des Autors ist gerade hier unübersehbar.

Weit weniger intensiv gestaltet sich die Einführung in den historischen Kontext, sowohl hinsichtlich der unmittelbaren politischen Ereignisse, die zum Fall Jerusalems führten, als auch hinsichtlich der politisch-sozialen Konstellationen in Juda und Jerusalem in exilischer und nach-exilischer Zeit. Dabei kann es natürlich nicht darum gehen, die dichterische Gestaltung durch historische, soziologische, archäologische und gegebenenfalls auch epigraphische Informationen anzufüllen, wohl aber darum, die konkrete Lebenswelt zu erfassen, in der die Kglg ihre primäre Beheimatung fanden und auf die sie auch einwirken wollten. Die zwölf Zeilen (36-37), die der politischen Totenklage und insbesondere den mesopotamischen Stadtuntergangsklagen gewidmet sind, reichen nicht aus, um die kulturelle Verwurzelung der Kglg in ihrer alt-orientalischen Umwelt zu beleuchten. Die in der Bibliographie genannte Monographie von M. Wischnowsky, *Tochter Zion. Aufnahme und Überwindung der Stadtklage in den Prophetenschriften des Alten Testaments* (WMANT 89; Neukirchen 2001), die im Index nicht mehr aufscheint und auch sonst keine Rolle im Kommentar spielt, hätte – unabhängig von den dort getroffenen Entscheidungen – eine größere Beachtung verdient.

Am Ende der Ausführungen zur Geschichte der Auslegung (49-57) erfährt der Leser, wie sich der Autor die Entstehung der Kglg vorstellt, natürlich immer unter dem Vorbehalt, die Daten und Fakten wären eigentlich nicht ausreichend, um solche Hypothesen untermauern zu können. Danach läge der ursprüngliche, vitale Sitz im Leben der Kglg, der eine erste Komposition und eine weitere mündliche Tradition zustande brachte, in der Zerstörung Jerusalems und dem Wegbrechen der tragenden politisch-religiösen Institutionen. Diese "sede vital primaria", die zeitlich in unmittelbarer Nähe zu den Exilsereignissen von 597 und 586 einzuordnen sei, habe in der "sede vital de la colección" eine Nachfolgerin bekommen, also einer Phase, in der die Sammlung weiter angewachsen sei und ihre literarische Ausgestaltung erhalten habe. Diese Schlussphase im Zuge der nachexilischen Restauration wird an das Ende des sechsten Jahrhunderts v. Chr. datiert (57). Am Ende der Kommentierung in den "conclusiones aproximadas" (483-486) kommt der Autor noch einmal auf dieses Entstehungsmodell zurück und entscheidet sich dann für eine nicht unerheblich spätere Enddatierung. Als terminus a quo gelten weiterhin die Exilsereignisse, doch als möglichen terminus ad quem wird nicht mehr das Ende des 6. Jahrhunderts angegeben, sondern eine Zeitspanne, die ein ganzes Jahrhundert hinter der Exilierung liegt, mit zusätzlich einigen Jahrzehnten der dichterischen Verfeinerung und Ausarbeitung: "No se puede descartar a priori que Lamentaciones, como probable obra de recopilación, viese la luz a lo largo, al menos, de un siglo, y que los poemas pudieran haber sido retocados y reformulados en décadas posteriores" (484; vgl. auch 426 zu Lam 5,2). Damit ergibt sich eine Einschätzung, die der des Rezensenten in seinem Kommentar (*Klagelieder*, [Herders Biblischer Kommentar; Freiburg i. Br. 2002]) sehr nahe kommt und die alles andere als ein sekundäres Problem darstellt. Die biblische Exegese als theologische Disziplin mit sowohl literarischer als auch historischer Ausrichtung kann sich – wie auch jede andere akademische Disziplin – solcher Hypothesen nicht entziehen, sondern ist verpflichtet, sie immer wieder auf ihre Gültigkeit und Haltbarkeit zu überprüfen. So weisen die Analysen von Kglg 1 und 2 auf eine Unmittelbarkeit zu den Exilsereignissen



hin, die in Klgl 4 und 5 nicht mehr gegeben ist. Hier spielt nicht mehr die direkte Kriegsbedrohung die Hauptrolle, sondern die anhaltende Nachkriegssituation mit einem Machtvakuum, in dem Versorgungsengpässe, Wucherei und Anarchie vorherrschen. Das mittlere Lied (Klgl 3) rückt gerade wegen der mosaikhafte Zusammenstellung seiner literarischen Gattungen (individuelle und kollektive Klage, weisheitliche Belehrung) und seiner Nähe zum Ijob-Buch in die Zeit des ausgehenden 5. Jahrhunderts ein. Bei aller berechtigten und angebrachten Vorsicht, hätte man sich im vorliegenden Kommentar ein wenig mehr Mut zur literarhistorischen Einordnung gewünscht. Bei der Heranziehung von innerbiblischen Vergleichstexten lässt sich eine solche Zurückhaltung nicht beobachten.

Eine Rezension ist nicht der Ort, um die vielen Details zu erörtern, die sich zwangsläufig bei der Kommentierung eines biblischen Buches ergeben. Ein Punkt sei aber doch herausgegriffen, der auch mehr ist als nur eine Detailfrage und auf den der Autor selbst mehrfach insistiert. Danach fehle in den Klgl, trotz 1,8.20, ein ausgebreitetes Sündenbekenntnis, eine Tatsache, die viele Ausleger bisher übersehen hätten. Daraus zieht der Autor eine folgenschwere Konklusion, denn der Dichter hätte hier unbewusst eine Art infantilen Narzissmus auf Seiten des antiken Israels beschrieben, der sich an seinem eigenen Schmerz labt (485; vgl. 144; 440; 466). Wenn Schuld überhaupt angesprochen würde, dann werde sie auf andere abgeladen (vgl. 2,14). Eine solche Haltung könne man nur als „infantilismo“ bezeichnen. Auf der letzten Seite des Kommentars (486) wird diese vermeintliche Uneinsichtigkeit in die eigene Schuldverstrickung auf die Geschichte Israels bis in die jüngste Zeit (?) ausgedehnt: „Denn im Laufe der späteren Geschichte hat dieses Selbstmitleid dem Volk Israel im Konzert der Nationen erhebliche Dividenden eingebracht! Ohne Zweifel, ein Paradox, gefördert durch den Schuldkomplex der anderen“ (486; Übersetzung U.B.). Diese Interpretation ist weder vom Text der Klgl gedeckt, noch ist es gerechtfertigt, den Opfern und ihren Nachkommen ihren tiefen Schmerz als „Selbstmitleid“ vorzuwerfen. Dies gilt für alle Opfer, unabhängig von Herkunft, Hautfarbe oder Religion. In keinem einzigen Kapitel der Klgl fehlt das Eingeständnis der eigenen Schuld, sei es auf bestimmte Schichten des Volkes, sei es auf die ganze Nation bezogen (Klgl 1,5.8.14.18.20; 2,14; 3,42; 4,6.13.22; 5,7.16). Das wirkliche theologische Problem der Klgl liegt nicht darin, dass Israel seine Schuld nicht eingesehen bzw. nicht eingestanden hätte, sondern darin, dass gerade trotz Einsicht und Bekenntnis und nach dem furchtbaren Zorngericht, Jhwhs Strafe immer noch allzu schmerzlich auf dem Volk liegt, so dass die Fortsetzung der Gottesbeziehung auf dem Spiel steht. So geht es auch in den Klgl, anders als vom Autor mehrfach betont (80; 230; 473), nicht um die Theodizeefrage, denn die Gerechtigkeit Jhwhs — gerade im Gericht — wird von Jerusalem/Zion als Personifikation Israels unumwunden zugegeben: „Gerecht ist Jhwh — denn seinem Befehl trotzte ich“ (1,18a). So interpretiert der Autor diese Stelle auch als einen weiteren Schritt Jerusalems/Zions in ihrem Schuldbekenntnis, das sie auf eine innere Reinigung vorbereitet („un paso más en su confesión, que la prepara a una purificación interior: reconoce que Yahvé ha sido justo“ [128]). Aber im weiteren Verlauf der Kommentierung bleibt von diesem richtigen Ansatz nicht viel übrig. Gerade die wiederholten Eingeständnisse der eigenen



Schuldigkeit (des Volkes und ihrer Führer) zeigen, dass es in den Klgl nicht um das Problem der Gerechtigkeit Jhwhs geht. Dieses Problem kommt erst auf, wenn die Not den Unschuldigen trifft (Ijob). In den Klgl geht es vielmehr darum, dass sich Jhwh nach dem Gericht wieder seinem Volk zuwenden muss, soll die Geschichte mit seinen Verehrern noch eine Fortsetzung finden (5,20-22).

Trotz dieser Divergenzen liegt hier ein großer spanischer Kommentar zu den Klgl vor, der durch seine akkurate Gestaltung und die durchweg gelungene Übersetzung besticht. Bleibt zu hoffen, dass er nicht nur in den romanischen Ländern Verbreitung findet; er hätte es sicherlich verdient.

Radboud University  
Faculty of Theology  
Erasmusplein, 1  
6525 HT Nijmegen  
Netherlands

Ulrich BERGES

## Novum Testamentum

Thomas STEGMAN, *The Character of Jesus. The Linchpin to Paul's Argument in 2 Corinthians* (AB 158; Pontificio Istituto Biblico). Roma 2005, xi + 470p.

Cette monographie est la reprise d'une thèse de doctorat présentée à l'université Emory (Atlanta, GA), sous la direction de L.T. Johnson. Malgré son titre, qui pourrait faire penser à une approche narrative, elle se propose bien plutôt de voir sur quels traits de Jésus Paul insiste en 2 Co. Cette lettre (cf. en particulier 2 Co 5,16) a en effet souvent été invoquée pour affirmer que Paul ne s'intéresse pas au Jésus terrestre, à son humanité, à sa vie, à son *ethos*. La thèse doctorale de T. Stegman se propose de montrer le contraire.

Pour défendre ce point de vue, l'auteur doit auparavant affronter la question de l'intégrité de la lettre et examiner les positions des exégètes sur ce point; il se prononce en définitive en faveur de l'intégrité (ch. 1). Il passe ensuite en revue les différentes perspectives à partir desquelles 2 Co a été étudiée (analyse rhétorique, etc.; ch. 2). S'appuyant sur les études contemporaines mettant en relief le thème de la fidélité et de l'obéissance de Jésus chez Paul (ch. 3), il arrive au cœur de sa thèse, à savoir la consistance donnée par 2 Co au personnage Jésus (ch. 4), et montre comment l'*ethos* de ce dernier a influencé la présentation que l'apôtre fait de lui-même en 2 Co (ch. 5) et les exhortations qu'il y adresse aux croyants (ch. 6).

Même si les hypothèses concernant la non intégrité de 2 Co et l'identité des opposants de Paul sont bien connues des spécialistes, le ch. 1 (5-42) n'en reste pas moins utile, car il présente les dossiers en suivant l'histoire de

l'exégèse de la lettre, de la fin du XIX<sup>e</sup> à aujourd'hui, et le non spécialiste aura ainsi connaissance de cette histoire, des raisons pour lesquelles on en est venu à douter de l'intégrité de 2 Co, des découpages proposés et de la date des différents billets antérieurement écrits par l'apôtre. L'auteur mentionne les positions les plus connues: celles de J.S. Semler (fin XVIII<sup>e</sup>), A. Hausrath (fin XIX<sup>e</sup>), J.H. Kennedy et A. Plummer, J. Weiss (début XX<sup>e</sup>), et, plus proches de nous, celles de G. Bornkamm, D. Georgi, H.D. Betz — quelques unes sont absentes, telle celle de W. Schmithals. Nonobstant la diversité des opinions concernant les partitions de 2 Co, il ajoute très justement qu'aujourd'hui l'hypothèse de partition la plus suivie est celle, simplifiée, de Semler (2 Co 10–13 initialement séparé et écrit postérieurement à 2 Co 1–9). Comme l'hypothèse de l'intégrité est essentielle à sa thèse, Stegman procède à une critique serrée des propositions de partition et de reconstruction chronologique des billets initialement séparés. Au demeurant, aujourd'hui, l'exégèse de 2 Co insiste beaucoup moins que par le passé sur la non intégrité, et les commentaires s'en passent — y compris le dernier en date, celui de M.J. Harris [NIGNTC], qui défend lui aussi l'intégrité de la lettre. Stegman s'attaque ensuite aux interprétations de 2 Co basées sur l'identification des opposants de Paul: gnostiques (W. Schmithals), hommes divins (D. Georgi), judaïsants (D. Oostendorp), apôtres jérusalémites (E. Käsemann, C.K. Barrett), spirituels (J. Sumney)? Aucune n'emporte l'adhésion: le chapitre finit sur une constatation négative, laquelle explique d'autres entreprises, de type rhétorique, que le ch. 2 examine de plus près (43-73). Il s'agit plus d'un survol que d'une présentation minutieuse, car Stegman ne veut pas proposer une alternative aux hypothèses de *dispositio* rhétorique déjà connues, bien plutôt insister sur ce qu'elles laissent de côté, à savoir les argumentations basées sur l'*ethos*, car, en 2 Co, on a affaire à une stratégie de l'*ethos*, dans la mesure où Paul «utilise l'*ethos* de Jésus tout au long de la lettre» (73). Avant de montrer qu'effectivement l'apôtre insiste sur l'*ethos* de Jésus, l'auteur propose un rapide tour d'horizon sur les travaux récents relatifs à la fidélité et à l'obéissance de Jésus chez Paul (en Rm 1,17 avec D.A. Campbell, en Rm 3,21-26 avec L.T. Johnson, en Rm 12–15 avec M. Thompson), en particulier ceux ayant insisté sur la substructure narrative de nombreux passages des lettres de l'apôtre: R.B. Hays, N.T. Wright, B. Witherington III, S.E. Fowl (74-116).

Ces positions méthodologiques étant admises, l'auteur peut développer sa thèse: la manière d'être et d'agir (l'*ethos*) de Jésus est sous-jacente aux principaux développements de 2 Co (ch. 4, 118-212), et c'est en référence à cet *ethos* que l'apôtre se présente lui-même (ch. 5, 213-303) et qu'il exhorte les croyants (ch. 6, 304-376). L'argumentation se présente comme une exégèse (une *close reading*) des passages suivants de 2 Co: 10,1 (douceur et bonté du Christ Jésus), 10,5 (où le syntagme ὑπακοή τοῦ Χριστοῦ est rendu par «obéissance du Christ»), puis 1,19-20 (son obéissance) 4,13 (sa fidélité), 5,14 (son amour), 8,9 (sa libéralité), 11,3 (son innocence), 5,20-21 et 13,4 (sa crucifixion pour nos péchés). Le ch. 5 (213-303) essaie de montrer qu'en 2 Co Paul n'offre qu'une seule recommandation de soi (ἑαυτὸν συνιστάνειν), celle basée sur une participation fidèle à l'*ethos* de Jésus (voir 2 Co 3,1; 5,12; 10,12.18), participation qui fait en quelque sorte de lui (mais aussi des autres croyants — cf. 2 Co 3,18) un *Jesus redivivus* (par le moyen de l'Esprit); l'idée

est défendue grâce à l'exégèse de passages comme 2 Co 1,3-7; 1,21-22; 2,14-17; 3,18; 4,4; 4,6 (et même 4,7-14, versets où Stegman voit Paul se mettre explicitement dans la dynamique de la fidélité de Jésus); 5,20-6,2; 11,7-11 et 12,9-10. Enfin, le ch. 6 (304-376) montre qu'en 2 Co Paul applique l'*ethos* de Jésus aux croyants. Pour appuyer sa thèse, l'auteur invoque et analyse les passages suivants: 2 Co 1,7 (la participation des croyants aux souffrances du Christ); 3,3 («lettre du Christ» compris comme lettre concernant le Christ, les croyants manifestant son *ethos*; le génitif est alors objectif); 3,18; 6,2; 8,9; les versets où Paul veut stimuler et vérifier l'obéissance des Corinthiens (2 Co 2,9; 7,15; 9,13; 10,5-6).

Que penser de cette thèse? Elle est globalement confirmée par l'ensemble du corpus paulinien, et même exemplairement par la lettre aux Philippiciens: en demandant aux croyants d'avoir les uns pour les autres l'attitude qui fut celle du Christ Jésus (Ph 2,5), toute d'humilité et d'obéissance jusqu'à la mort (Ph 2,6-8), en décrivant aussi son itinéraire à partir de celui du Christ dans la périautologie de Ph 3,4-14, Paul n'énonce pas des convictions qu'il ne formulerait pas ailleurs: comme l'a bien vu Stegman, on peut les retrouver en quasiment toutes ses lettres. Si la thèse doit être examinée, c'est plutôt dans sa démonstration, autrement dit dans le choix et l'exégèse des passages de 2 Co sollicités pour l'appuyer. La majorité des passages de 2 Co mentionnés ci-dessus confirment largement la thèse de Stegman, même ceux où l'on rencontre le génitif Χριστοῦ, si difficile à rendre en nos langues, comme le ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ de 5,14, le ἡ ὑπακοή τοῦ Χριστοῦ de 10,5 ou encore le ἀλήθεια Χριστοῦ de 11,10. Il est pour cela inutile de discuter ces passages. Mais en voulant montrer que certains d'entre eux, interprétés autrement par les bibles et les commentaires, vont dans son sens, l'auteur peut être pris en défaut. Prenons quelques exemples.

Il traduit 2 Co 4,13: «Ayant le même esprit de *fidélité* (πνεῦμα πίστεως), selon ce qui est écrit: 'J'ai été fidèle (ἐπίστευσα), voilà pourquoi j'ai parlé', nous aussi nous sommes fidèles (πιστεύομεν), et ainsi nous parlons». Malgré ses efforts pour montrer que verbe πιστεύω ici signifie «être fidèle», l'auteur arrive seulement à convaincre son lecteur du contraire: (1) En Ps 115/116,1, l'hébreu et le grec signifient bien «avoir confiance», et il faudrait montrer que Paul glisse sur les signifiés; (2) lorsqu'il veut exprimer l'idée de fidélité (ou de fiabilité), et pour éviter donc tout malentendu avec l'idée de croire (πιστεύειν), Paul utilise uniformément l'expression πιστὸς εἶναι: 1 Co 4,17; 7,25; 2 Co 1,18; (voir aussi les *antilegomena*: Col 1,7; 2Th 3,3; 1 Tm 6,2; 2 Tm 2,2); (3) le contexte immédiat n'insiste pas sur la fidélité de Paul (et des autres apôtres), mais sur le paradoxe de leur situation: malgré leur situation humainement désespérée, leur foi les fait néanmoins parler et manifester la force de Dieu dans leur faiblesse. Il est ainsi déconseillé de prendre 2 Co 4,13 comme témoin de l'être fidèle de Paul calqué sur celui de Jésus.

L'auteur pense aussi que 2 Co 5,21 soulignerait implicitement l'*ethos* de Jésus, car la mort en croix est le point extrême d'un itinéraire d'obéissance et de fidélité. Si tel est bien le sens de Ph 2,8, il est en revanche improbable que 2 Co 5,21 fasse allusion à l'*ethos* de Jésus. Je m'en suis expliqué récemment et me contenterai de mentionner l'article en question: «God made Christ to be Sin (2 Corinthians 5:21): Reflections on a Pauline Paradox», *The Redemption* (ed. S.T. Davis – D. Kendall – G. O'Collins) (Oxford 2004) 101-120.

De même, 2 Co 10,5 (cf. 135) signifierait «we take captive every thought unto 'Christ-obedience'», c'est-à-dire pour l'amener à être comme celle du Christ; il ne s'agit donc pas d'obéir *au* Christ, comme tous l'interprètent, y compris le dernier commentaire en date, celui de M.J. Harris («obedience to Christ», 664). Il s'agit encore d'un génitif ambigu (ὕπακοή τοῦ Χριστοῦ), et dont seul le contexte peut nous dire s'il est épexégétique, subjectif, objectif ou d'origine. Or le contexte n'insiste aucunement sur l'*ethos* du Christ, et s'il est possible que le génitif soit subjectif, en vertu du principe d'accumulation (cf. ceux mentionnés plus haut), cela ne semble pas probable, eu égard au contexte immédiat de 2 Co 10,5.

Le dernier passage pouvant prêter à critique (pour le moins à discussion) est 2 Co 11,3 (cf. 196-204), où contre l'opinion de tous les commentateurs et traducteurs, pour qui le syntagme εἰς τὸν Χριστόν dénote une orientation, Stegman pense que Paul parle de la simplicité et de l'innocence *du* Christ.

Telles sont quelques unes de nos critiques et réticences, sur ces points mineurs. Car l'ensemble de la thèse est très bien mené et les arguments sont dans l'ensemble très pertinents. L'ouvrage montre indirectement combien la manière dont Paul parle de lui et exhorte ses correspondants est presque toujours directement ou indirectement christologique. Non que le Christ éclipse Dieu le Père ou l'Esprit, mais en épousant son itinéraire les croyants pourront toujours mieux comprendre que Dieu est Père et qu'il nous a donné son Esprit.

Via della Pilotta, 25  
I-00187 Rome

Jean-Noël ALETTI

Cesare MARCHESELLI-CASALE, *Lettera agli ebrei*. Nuova versione, introduzione e commento (I libri biblici, Nuovo Testamento, 16). Milano, Paoline Editoriale Libri, 2005. 827 p. 14,5 × 22,5. €38.00.

This commentary is a frontal assault on Shakespeare's dictum "Brevity is the soul of wit". The dictum wins: the commentary is simply too diffuse and too lengthy, at least as presently formatted, to serve as an intelligible guide to the points being made by the author of Hebrews. *Forma dat esse*. But the obverse of this is that the work has considerable value by reason of the immense amount of information it puts at the disposal of the reader prepared to evaluate it.

This commentary is perhaps best viewed as a series of excursions on the text of Hebrews. These excursions cover all aspects of study of the epistle: a lengthy introduction to all relevant questions (19-89), a translation of the Greek text with extended discussion (91-642), a presentation of the "theological message" (643-735), a lexicon of useful terms (736-758), a selected bibliography based on key topics (759-769), a truly helpful general bibliography (770-970), and indices of authors (809-814), of Greek words (815-817), of classical authors (818-821), of Fathers of the Church (821-824), and of intertestamental literature (824). All this is rounded off with a table of

contents which is too compact, reflecting the extended, relatively undifferentiated treatment in the section on exegesis (825-827). Despite the needed reservations, this is a genuinely impressive work and one which any student of Hebrews will find useful in a variety of ways. The word "monumental" comes to mind.

I begin with some minor observations: a) The freedom from typographical errors should be noted at the outset. In this respect the book is a *tour de force* for which the author and editors have every reason to be proud. (They meet their match in "Goodenough", though.). b) The bibliographical outreach is impressive. In this regard the work is a convenient up-date of W.L. Lane's memorable study *Hebrews* (WBC 47A-47B; Dallas TX 1991). c) Students of Philo will appreciate the frequent invocations, all carefully indexed, of the sage of Alexandria. d) The use of the Fathers of the Church is a constant feature and is especially helpful at the vexed interpretation of Heb 4,12-13 (231-232). e) And the heart of the book, the excursus-like exegetical and theological treatment, will also yield rich rewards, but only after much careful sifting and evaluating amid a plethora of bibliographical leads. f) One of the many points which the author makes is that resurrection from the dead is a central factor in the epistle (539). In this he is undoubtedly correct, and this observation comes as a welcome corrective to such splendid commentaries as those of H.W. Attridge (*The Epistle to the Hebrews. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* [Hermeneia; Philadelphia 1989]) and P. Ellingworth (*The Epistle to the Hebrews. A Commentary on the Greek Text* [NIGTC; Grand Rapids MI 1993]). g) The question of the validity of the Mosaic Law in the epistle is discussed perhaps too briefly (362, n. 101). But the basic view adopted, that the epistle does consider it as about to lose its permanent validity at least for Christians, seems correct to the reviewer. h) A simple sentence indicates that for the author the section 1,5-14 attributes to the Son what is said of God in the Old Testament (139). This is certainly true. But perhaps it would not be out of place to observe that thus the real point of this section is that Christ is Son of God in an altogether special sense, and the emphasis on the superiority of the Son over the angels is just a way of clarifying this foundational truth.

But for the reviewer there are some significant problems regarding the content. For example, the structure. The author presents a brief summary of the various views of authors with regard to how the epistle is structured (83-89). He gives his own structure in detail (87-88), remarking that it is a modification of the structure of A. Vanhoye and is designed to bring out better the content intended by the author of Hebrews (89). Vanhoye's structure is praised as the best basis for any future study of how the epistle is organized (88-89). It is considered particularly helpful because it compares the epistle to a mountain top which one ascends (1,1-7,28), enjoys (8,1-10,18), and from which one descends (10,19-13,21) (341, n. 14). But this view does not seem to correspond to Vanhoye's structure, at least as given in his book *La structure littéraire de l'épître aux Hébreux* (Paris 1962), where his five parts are given as 1,5-2,18 (Part I), 3,1-5,10 (Part II), 5,11-10,39 (Part III), 11,1-12,13 (Part IV), and 12,14-13,19 (Part V). Further, the author suggests that the two citations from Jeremiah about the "new covenant" form a large inclusion (8,8-12 and 10,16-17). He uses this

division to frame his discussion of the content of the entire section 8,1–10,18 (428–434), a procedure which the reviewer considers eminently sensible. But in his initial presentation of his structure (88) he separates 8,1–13 from 9,1–10,18, i.e., his views on pages 428–434 conflict significantly with his views on page 88. Further, this view of the importance of Jeremiah's citation as a major element in the structure of Hebrews conflicts with Vanhoye's interpretation, which places the first citation of Jeremiah in the very center of his central part (8,1–9,28) and the second citation in another section (10,1–18) balancing still another, previous section (7,1–28). In other words, for Vanhoye, Jeremiah's citation does not figure significantly in the structuring of the heart of the epistle. To take a view so different from this seems odd in a book which praises Vanhoye's structure so highly. The extensive nature of the discussion tends to hide these major inconsistencies. What the author seems to be moving towards is a structure in which 8,1–10,18 is the crucial central exposition of the epistle based on the citation of Jeremiah, with the contents admirably summarized in 8,1–2: the high priest in his post-resurrection ministry, which centers on the new covenant. 10,19–39, then, becomes an exhortation based on this central exposition. Thus the author's construal of the central section as having to do primarily with the forgiveness of sins, on the basis of the citation from Jeremiah (428), seems to elevate a minor theme of the section to the major theme.

The thorny exegetical challenge of Heb 6,4–6 and Heb 10,26–29 and the "unforgivable sin" is discussed at length in the book (277–283, 448–454, 654–656). The conclusion for the author is that the text does not permit of an interpretation which denies forgiveness to an apostate: the severe language couched in absolutes used by the author of Hebrews is simply a form of hyperbole designed to deter (654). In the case of a text which has caused such perplexity for centuries the reviewer of necessity must take a tentative approach in proposing a possible solution which adheres more closely to the identity of the addressees. But such a solution does seem possible. The author himself seems to hint at such a solution when he discusses Num 15,10 and Deut 17,6, which indicate sins for which there is no forgiveness (448–449). But in applying these texts to Hebrews he is not ruthlessly coherent. If, as it seems probable, the epistle was directed originally to Christians who had come from Judaism, then a deliberate lapse from belief in the sacrificial death of Jesus (Heb 6,4–6) of necessity resulted in their return to the laws of Judaism, i.e., the Mosaic covenant. And it is precisely in this covenant that there is no forgiveness for deliberate sin. Hebrews places emphasis in both texts on the knowledge which the putative apostates had acquired as Christians (6,4: "... those enlightened once and for all..."; 10,26: "...after receiving knowledge of the truth..."). This knowledge does not disappear when these Christians lapse back into Judaism: they know now who it was who was crucified for their sakes (6,6), they know now what the "blood of the covenant" is (10,29). Forgiveness is always available for one who is under the new covenant; but for one who is under the Mosaic covenant there is no forgiveness (10,28). In other words, a solution to the crux of the unforgivable sin may possibly be found by taking the presuppositions of the respective covenants as legally binding, and by taking the addressees as truly having originally come from Judaism to Christianity. Such presuppositions may also



explain why there is no salutation (53): the author did not feel authorized to address an official Church document to Christians who had come from Judaism.

The author takes a dim view of the reviewer's position that the λόγος of Heb 4,12-13 refers to Christ (227, n. 180). But he seems to misunderstand the argument. There is no question of the earthly Jesus as being the λόγος; the λόγος is the risen Christ (Heb 3,6; 4,14). The name "Jesus" is brought into the discussion because of the reference to Joshua as Ἰησοῦς in 4,8. It is this reference to Joshua which is so important for the exegesis of 4,12, for mention of his name changes the context from one of "hearing" to one of "circumcision". The actions of Joshua are being viewed retroactively from the act by which Christians are introduced into God's rest, baptism. And the allusion to Joshua in the context of baptism evokes his fleshly circumcision of the Old Testament which was ineffective with regard to entering God's rest. What is needed for entering into this rest is the spiritual circumcision of the heart foreseen but not achieved in the Old Testament (Jer 4,4; 9,24; Deut 10,12-22; 30,6). This definitive, spiritual circumcision explains the imagery of physical circumcision in 4,12 terminating with the word καρδιά, "heart". The real problem with the addressees is that they were in danger of succumbing to hardness of heart as did the desert generation (Heb 3,8.9.12.15; 4,9). The desert generation who did not listen to the word of God did not enter because they did not heed the word and thus had hardness of heart. But Joshua had listened to the word and had entered the land but he did not attain the rest of God either, because he had no way to achieve the required circumcision of the heart. Hardness of heart is the common denominator of 3,7-4,11, not hearing the word. This would seem to be the basic understanding of the text by Origen and some other Fathers (cf. 231-232), though not by John Chrysostom (232). In other words, the fundamental context of Heb 4,12 is about circumcision of the heart, not about hearing the word of God. The only way to attain circumcision of the heart is through Christian baptism, which is effected by Christ as λόγος, who is more effective than any knife of circumcision. Heb 4,13 looks to what follows, with God being viewed as the judge and the λόγος as intercessor. This is why 4,14-16 speaks about Christ as intercessor. Heb 4,8-11 prepares the way for the meaning of λόγος in v. 12; the meaning of λόγος in v. 13 prepares the way for Heb 4,14-16.

Commentators on Hebrews tend to find in Chapter 13 of the epistle a scriptural Sargasso Sea, and the work under review is no exception. In the general outline (88) there is the neat label for 13,1-19: "Vita cristiana e sue dinamiche". But the verse headings under which the chapter is discussed reveal a certain disarray: 13,1-6; 13,7.15.17; 13,9-14.15; 13,10-15; 13,16-19 (596-632). Some suggestions: 1) Vanhoye's use of ἡγούμενοι in 13,7 and 13,17 to frame the intervening verses is well taken; 2) studies by H. Gese ("Der Herkunft des Herrenmahls", in Idem, *Zur biblischen Theologie. Alttestamentliche Vorträge* [Tübingen 1989] 107-127) and by J. Thurén (*Das Lobopfer der Hebräer. Studien zum Aufbau und Anliegen von Hebräerbrief 13* [Acta Academiae Aboensis. Ser. A. Humaniora 47.1; Abo 1973]) on the *tôdâ* are eminently worth consulting (neither figures in the bibliography); 3) the section 13,1-17 has an intriguing resemblance to the structure of the Latin



Mass (examination of conscience (vv. 1-5a), readings from Scripture (vv. 5b-6), sacramental action (framed by v. 7 and v. 17).

Much more could be said about this flawed but fascinating work. It deserves a place in any serious library on Hebrews.

Pontifical Biblical Institute  
Via della Pilotta, 25  
I-00187 Rome

James SWETNAM, S.J.

### Varia

David R. JACKSON, *Enochic Judaism. Three Defining Paradigm Exemplars* (Library of Second Temple Studies 49). London – New York, T&T Clark International, 2004. vii-316 p. 16 × 24. £70.00

The last number of years has seen a veritable explosion of interest in the collection of works known as *1 Enoch*. In this study, Jackson proposes to “investigate the Qumran literature from another perspective, that of the sections of *1 Enoch* found in the Qumran caves” (14). He takes *1 Enoch* as his “point of departure” in order to “seek to identify the self-definition (and orthodoxy) which these documents set forth and then to trace the acceptance and development of this tradition in the literature of Second Temple Judaism” (14). Jackson suggests this perspective as a corrective to what he sees as other inadequate approaches to basic questions about the nature of the group who lived at Qumran, its theology/ideology and origins. *1 Enoch* qualifies as the lens through which to understand the Qumran community because: (1) the Aramaic fragments from Qumran “are among the oldest fragments found in the caves”; (2) *1 Enoch* is probably “the oldest non-Tanak composition included in the Qumran library”; (3) “elements of *1 Enoch* are further developed in a number of other works”; (4) “both the text and person of Enoch are cited by a number of texts, including undisputed sectarian texts, as authoritative” (14). Additionally, *1 Enoch* can play this role since the sections of it found at Qumran display an “exclusive self understanding” and a kind of inner-orthodoxy, which Jackson argues warrants the label “Enochic Judaism”.

As the means of describing the self-understanding that Jackson claims for *1 Enoch*, he invokes Thomas Kuhn’s famous notion of the paradigm shift, or a different way of seeing — the idea that periodically some new model or hypothesis does not simply demonstrate the inadequacy of previous hypotheses, but shows them to be false, and “what is already ‘known’ is reinterpreted and what previously could not be known can now be investigated” (15). A paradigm represents a body of beliefs, what Kuhn called

a “disciplinary matrix” that includes “shared examples” or “exemplars”. Jackson argues that we find at Qumran “a body of texts which witness to a system of belief” that did not survive the traumas of 70 and 135 C.E. (15). Further, “‘Enochic Judaism’ would represent a ‘paradigm shift’ at both the level of a ‘disciplinary matrix’ and in its understanding of particular aspects of reality” (16). Jackson then identifies an “Enochic paradigm” in which there is an established order constituted by God, and deviation from that order defines sin. Within this paradigm Jackson isolates in the Enoch texts three “paradigm exemplars” or sets of “problem-solutions by which students learn to apply the paradigm” (21). Each of the three provides an example of the order/deviation paradigm of Jackson’s Enochic Judaism. The first, the “Shemikhazah exemplar”, focuses on the illegitimate sexual unions of the angels with human women instigated by the angelic leader Shemikhazah. The second, the “‘Aza’el exemplar”, features the angelic revelation of heavenly secrets under the leadership of the angel ‘Aza’el about technology and knowledge “by which the enemies of the righteous can develop technology to overpower them” (27). The third, the “cosmic exemplar,” explains the transgression of the spirits whom God set up as authorities over cosmic phenomena related to the establishment of the calendar. For each of these exemplars (explained in chapters 3, 4, 5), Jackson looks at how each “was employed in defining orthodoxy within Enochic Judaism between 250 BCE and 70 CE, and therefore as identifying texts from the Qumran literature which saw themselves as standing within this tradition” (27).

From his analysis of these three exemplars and which texts contain one or more of the three, Jackson concludes that approximately two-thirds of the manuscripts at Qumran “are Enochic sectarian works. Roughly half of these serve to reveal or develop the Enochic paradigm and world-view...while half reflect on social history and systems within the movement at different times and places” (219). In his survey of Second Temple literature, he finds no works outside of the Qumran library, other than the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and the *Parables of Enoch*, that participate in this paradigm. He further reasons from these conclusions that the origins of the Qumran sect came “at the point at which the Enochic paradigm brought together these three paradigm exemplars and made their acceptance the *sine qua non* of orthodoxy, and the reception of such works by revelation and subsequent possession a validation of elect status” (220). The almost total identity of the Enochic paradigm with texts found at Qumran means for Jackson that the Qumran sect “would appear to be the only known social embodiment of what we have termed Enochic Judaism” (221). Those Christian and post-70 Jewish works that show familiarity with Enochic literature “do so from the perspective either of a belief system which would be mutually exclusive to Enochic Judaism, or from a point in history where this literature represented the socially disembodied relics of an extinct religious movement” (221).

Several aspects of Jackson’s analysis stand out as quite helpful. Most importantly, his careful analysis of the theme of regularity and deviance demonstrates how it works in the Shemikhazah, ‘Aza’el and cosmic “exemplars” and how central it is to other works outside of *1 Enoch*. His detailed examination of the calendar in *Jubilees* really clarified for me its calendrical scheme as well as a number of problems with that work. I do,

however, have some more general methodological concerns that affect my ability to be convinced by his larger argument.

Jackson uses Kuhn's notion of the "paradigm shift" to argue for a particular "Enochic paradigm" that he sees operative through the three exemplars he identifies. What I do not see, however, is how this paradigm represents a *shift* from another paradigm. How does the paradigm that he describes in *1 Enoch* and other texts represent a "revolution" (to use Kuhn's term) that "serves to solve previously insoluble problems and to prove the previously accepted model/consensus to be false, not merely inadequate" (15)? Jackson notes that Ian Barbour found the idea helpful to talk about religious change, but he does not elaborate what religious change(s) the "Enochic" paradigm wrought. What previously existing and generally accepted paradigm did the Enochic one overturn? If we can identify a genuine Enochic *paradigm*, perhaps it represents one of a number of competing paradigms that we could find operating in Second Temple Jewish literature.

I also do not think that Jackson sufficiently attends to problems that the individual works that make up *1 Enoch* and their redactional history create for his thesis. In chapters 1 and 2 where he establishes both the methodology for his study and the basic "Enochic" paradigm, Jackson relies heavily on *1 Enoch* 1–5. Yet George Nickelsburg in his Hermeneia commentary (*1 Enoch* 1 [Minneapolis 2002]), for example, argues that *1 Enoch* 1–5 serves as an introduction to the Book of the Watchers, and thus rather than the foundational articulation of the paradigm it would represent a later summary and framing of at least this one Enochic book (and perhaps others).

These issues come into greater relief when we examine Jackson's claims that *1 Enoch* is sectarian. This assessment is central to the heart of his thesis, since it provides the basis for arguing that "it is difficult to see how such literature [i.e. works like *1 Enoch*] could be regarded as the 'common heritage' of Second Temple Judaism" (4). If it is not part of a larger common heritage of Jews and it makes "absolute and exclusivistic claims" similar to those found in the Qumran sectarian documents, then *1 Enoch* might well function as the lens Jackson intends it to be when he asks questions about who the people at Qumran were. But sectarians might well use a book, even if it is itself not sectarian. Jackson relies primarily on *1 Enoch* 1–5 to make this case in chapter 1, but these chapters are a later introduction, as I noted. He also invokes the other Enochic sections found at Qumran, most notably the Book of the Watchers, the Astronomical Book and the Book of Dreams, but certainly the sectarian character of these works, and in particular the Book of the Watchers and the Astronomical Book in as much as they represent the self-perception of some specific and exclusivistic movement or group, has been contested (see, for example, John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination* [New York 1984] 57–58 or Gabriele Boccaccini, *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism* [Grand Rapids, MI 2002]). I have much less trouble than does Jackson imagining works like these as being part of the "common heritage" (however broadly or narrowly that might be conceived) of Jews in the Second Temple period. If the sectarian character, and hence the restricted use within certain social groups, of these works is less secure than Jackson concludes, then one might question whether the Enochic corpus really can function as the best framework for asking about the origins and nature of the

Qumran community. Consequently I think that the arguments about the nature of the Qumran community that he rejects in chapter 1 cannot necessarily be set aside so easily.

Finally, we scholars might be well served to find other alternatives to the phrase “Enochic Judaism”. Even though Jackson distinguishes his use of the phrase from that of G. Boccaccini, I, for one, am not yet convinced that there was an historical movement or group that we can call “Enochic” *pace* Boccaccini, and I do not think that Jackson has made his case for an “exclusive self understanding of the sections of *1 Enoch* found at Qumran” (14) that would warrant the label. The phrase seems to be getting fuzzier rather than more descriptive.

Too often a reviewer’s assessment of a book’s overall argument is understood to reflect whether he/she liked or did not like it. In my own experience, the kind of innovative perspectives like the one that Jackson presents in this study are often the most engaging. Anyone who might chance to leaf through my copy of his book would see the copious highlights and marginal notes that demonstrate my own engagement with its claims. Jackson’s study is certainly one that scholars who are interested in *1 Enoch* and Qumran will find stimulating and challenging.

9 W. Packer Ave.  
Bethlehem, PA  
USA

Benjamin WRIGHT

# NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

## *In memoriam* **P. Pietro Boccaccio, S.J.**

Il 24 giugno 2006 è deceduto a Roma il P. Pietro Boccaccio, S.J., all'età di quasi 96 anni, di cui buona parte passati al Pontificio Istituto Biblico. Con lui scompare la memoria storica dei primi tempi del nostro Istituto, soprattutto per quella fase di trasformazione accademica e abitativa che avvenne nel dopo guerra.

Entrato nella Compagnia di Gesù a soli 16 anni, nel 1926, compì gli studi filosofici e teologici a Chieri, nei pressi di Torino, sua città natale; tra i due cicli di formazione ecclesiastica, si era laureato in lettere classiche all'Università di Padova, con una tesi che aveva per argomento la lingua ebraica. Venne a Roma nel 1943, con un viaggio avventuroso sotto i bombardamenti, per completare la sua formazione con la Licenza in S. Scrittura presso il P.I.B., conseguita nel 1945.

Iniziò a insegnare ebraico alla Pontificia Università Gregoriana, dal 1944 al 1946; e poi a Chieri, dal 1946 al 1949, dove diede anche dei Corsi di Introduzione e di Egesi dell'Antico Testamento. Nel 1949 venne chiamato al Biblico quale Professore di ebraico e aramaico; da allora fino al 1985 fu il titolare dell'insegnamento di tali lingue, fece parte del Comitato di Redazione di Biblica, e venne nominato Direttore Responsabile di diversi periodici del nostro Istituto. La sua lunga attività di Docente è ricordata dai suoi studenti come un esempio di chiarezza e affabilità. Dedito in maniera esclusiva al servizio dell'insegnamento, oltre a fornire la revisione e l'integrazione del Dizionario Ebraico-Latino dello Zorell, si premurò di mettere a disposizione dei suoi alunni dei testi ebraici di cui non si aveva ancora l'edizione critica; con la collaborazione del suo allievo G. Berardi, curò dunque l'edizione ciclostilata di alcuni manoscritti del Mar Morto e quella dell'ebraico dell'Ecclesiastico, ancora oggi non priva di interesse.

Chi ha vissuto in comunità con il P. Boccaccio ne ha sempre apprezzato la testimonianza di fede e di umile servizio fraterno; i suoi numerosi studenti ne ricordano la benevolenza e la disponibilità.

Pontificio Istituto Biblico  
Roma

PIETRO BOVATI, S.J.

## **Rethinking Paul On the Way Toward a Revised Paradigm<sup>(1)</sup>**

The thoroughgoing Jewishness of the Apostle Paul as well as the fact that the Gospel he proclaimed is in radical conflict with the political ideology of the Roman Empire are both essential components for an accurate interpretation of the Apostle's theology.

### *1. The Dominant Pauline Paradigm in the 1960's*

*Romans.* During the time that I was a graduate student at both Harvard and Heidelberg it was thought that the most significant Pauline letter and the one that contained the key to interpret all of the others was Romans. As a result Paul's earliest letter, 1 Thessalonians, was viewed as relatively inconsequential for the interpretation of Pauline theology. Further, Romans was regarded as essentially a non-historical theological compendium. An eloquent spokesman for this position is the essay of my own teacher, Günther Bornkamm, "The Letter to the Romans as Paul's Last Will and Testament"<sup>(2)</sup>.

*Graeco-Roman World.* It was commonly held that the various philosophies of this period, whether, for example, Stoicism or Gnosticism, were dominant influences on Paul theology although, interestingly enough, little sustained attention was given to the political context in which Paul exercised his apostolic ministry and the far-reaching consequences of that context for his ministry.

*Acts.* Widespread was a highly critical, dismissive attitude toward Acts as well as, paradoxically, a very uncritical use of selected references to Acts when it supported preconceived agendas. Thus, for example, the significance of the Acts references to Paul and Tarsus are affirmed while the reference to Paul and Jerusalem in the same verse (Acts 22,3; see also 21,39) is denied. As a result the highly suspect chronology of Acts is adopted via the back door and controls much of Pauline chronology to the present moment<sup>(3)</sup>.

*Justification.* The conflict between justification by faith vs. works of the law is seen as central to Pauline theology. This perspective, while not necessarily incorrect, was presented in a manner that is theologically abstract, superficial and non-historical as well as failing to significantly engage either Second Temple Judaism or the Jewishness of Paul.

<sup>(1)</sup> This article represents the lecture given at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome on April 4, 2006, in connection with the "Joseph Gregory McCarthy Professorship" held by the author. Although some revisions have been made, the style is kept as close as possible to the oral presentation.

<sup>(2)</sup> G. BORNKAMM, "The Letter to the Romans as Paul's Last Will and Testament", *The Romans Debate* (ed. K.P. DONFRIED) (Peabody, MA 2001) 16-28.

<sup>(3)</sup> See K.P. DONFRIED, "Thessaloniciens et la chronologie paulinienne", *Paul, une théologie en construction* (ed. A. DETTWILER – J.-D. KAESTLI – D. MARGUERAT) (Le monde de la Bible 51; Geneve 2004) 107-134.

## 2. Revisiting the “Dominant” Paradigm in 2006

While Romans remains a Pauline letter of extraordinary importance, it is today no longer viewed primarily as an abstract theological tract but one addressed to a specific set of historical circumstances in Rome and beyond<sup>(4)</sup>. It has been recognized that a coherent Pauline theology can only be generated from the specific, contingent situations to which all seven genuine letters were addressed and that, in turn, the individual contingent situations may be illuminated by the more comprehensive coherent theology resulting from the various contingent situations. Therefore all of the recognized Pauline letters must be given detailed and sustained attention. As a result of this changed situation we have seen over the last twenty years a magnificent blossoming of research with regard to 1 Thessalonians within its unique, contingent situation<sup>(5)</sup>.

With regard to the Jewishness of Paul and his interaction with the Graeco-Roman culture of his congregations, there have been some shifts but these still await more comprehensive development. That the core of Paul’s theology is heavily shaped by the philosophical influences of the Graeco-Rome world can no longer be maintained. Rather, it is precisely Paul as a Jew, as 1 Corinthians 10 illustrates so effectively, who addresses and interacts with his congregations located in the midst of that Graeco-Roman context. He is a Jew who believes that Messiah has come. For Qumran, also a community of the new covenant, it is, on the contrary, to speak metaphorically, five minutes before midnight on New Year’s eve whereas for Paul it is five minutes after; one group expects messiahs to arrive with intense expectancy and for the other he has arrived and is expected to return imminently. Even though for Paul the Messiah has come and he has been transformed by his Damascus experience, he still remains a Jew who never gives up his Jewishness. For this reason it is imperative to inquire into the diverse patterns of Jewish thought and interaction in this Second Temple period; it is such an examination that will allow us to understand more effectively the theological and exegetical method of Paul the Jew. And beyond this, only the painstaking examination of each epistolary context will allow for a clearer comprehension of Paul’s specific intentions in communicating as a Jew with his Graeco-Roman audiences in the midst of an alien world.

By stressing the Jewishness of Paul one must not deny the validity of the Graeco-Roman context for Paul’s apostolic activity; it must be recognized that the Jewish Paul who is now “in Christ” interacts with the pagan culture in partnership with his churches and as one who himself proclaims a theology that is in fundamental conflict with the political theology of the Empire<sup>(6)</sup>. A splendid example for the use of such politico-religious language is 1 Thessalonians. It is difficult to reconstruct in detail the original Pauline message proclaimed in the city and all we can hope for are glimmers of it in

<sup>(4)</sup> DONFRIED, *Romans Debate*, iv-Ixxii.

<sup>(5)</sup> See, for example, K.P. DONFRIED, *Paul, Thessalonica and Early Christianity* (Edinburgh – Grand Rapids 2002); also, *The Thessalonians Debate. Methodological Discord or Methodological Synthesis?* (ed. K.P. DONFRIED – J. BEUTLER) (Grand Rapids 2000).

<sup>(6)</sup> See J.D. CROSSAN – J.L. REED, *In Search of Paul* (San Francisco 2004).



the written correspondence. If 1 Thessalonians is at all representative of his original preaching then we certainly do find elements which could have been understood or misunderstood in a distinctly political sense. In 2,12 God, according to the Apostle, calls the Thessalonian Christians "into his own βασιλεία"; in 5,3 there is a frontal attack on the *Pax et Securitas* program of the early Principate and in the verses just preceding this criticism one finds three terms heavily laden with political allusions: παρουσία, ἀπάντησις and κυρίος is related to the visitation of a king or some other dignitary; when used as court language παρουσία refers to the arrival of Caesar, a king or an official; ἀπάντησις refers to the citizens meeting a dignitary who is about to visit the city. The term κυρίος, especially when used in the same context as the two preceding terms, also has undeniable political connotations. The people in the eastern Mediterranean used the term κυρίος to refer to the Roman emperors from Augustus on. Although the first verifiable inscription of the *Kyrios*-title in Greece dates to the time of Nero, the numismatic evidence is very compelling. The obverse of one coin from Thessalonica prior to Paul's ministry there has a head of Julius Caesar with the legend θεός, making it evident that Julius was acclaimed a god of the city, as well as another in which Octavian is designated as *divi filius*, with the divine Julius on the reverse. All of this, coupled with the use of εὐαγγέλιον six times in 1 Thessalonians could easily be understood as violating the "decrees of the emperor" in the most blatant manner as Acts 17,7 reports quite accurately: "They are all acting contrary to the decrees of the emperor, saying that there is another king named Jesus". Paul's gospel of Jesus Christ as Lord is in fundamental opposition to the gospel of Caesar Augustus as Lord. It is for this reason that I have argued elsewhere that the deaths referred to in 1 Thessalonians 4 result from an ad hoc persecution are due to politico-religious conflict generated by Paul's preaching in that city<sup>(7)</sup>.

With regard to the interpretation of Acts in relationship to Paul little consensus has been reached and the pendulum swings wildly hither and yon between uncritical acceptance and critical skepticism. Although rejecting both, I would suggest that every incident and report in Luke needs to be critically examined in its own right; in some places his harmonizing agenda will be obvious and in others, in spite of this agenda, one will, at times, be able to ferret out historical vignettes of gold. Once denied by most New Testament scholars but today archaeologically verified, the reference to πολιτάρχης in Acts 17 is, in fact, the accurate title for Macedonian city authorities during this period. Conversely, Acts 18 and its report of Paul in Corinth appears to be a conflation of at least two accounts upon which no accurate chronology of Paul can be developed<sup>(8)</sup>.

Turning now to E.P. Sanders and the alleged "new perspective of Paul": he and his associates have been as keen on dismissing "justification by faith" as the central theme of Romans as they have been adamant that Paul's use of

(7) For a more complete discussion see K.P. DONFRIED, "The Cults of Thessalonica and the Thessalonian Correspondence", ID., *Paul, Thessalonica and Early Christianity*, 21-48.

(8) See further K.P. DONFRIED, "1 Thessalonians, Acts and the Early Paul", ID., *Paul, Thessalonica and Early Christianity*, 69-98.

the phrase “works of the law” is a distortion of Judaism<sup>(9)</sup>. One positive result of this discussion is the recognition that the Graeco-Roman context is inadequate to explain the deepest levels of Pauline theology and that the Jewish context is essential. Although Sanders’ understanding of Judaism is deeply flawed he has helped shift the discussion to matters Jewish<sup>(10)</sup>. In his 1977 publication, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*<sup>(11)</sup>, Sanders had many of the Dead Sea Scrolls scrolls available but made inadequate use of them. Today we have some 900 Qumran manuscripts at our disposal and these Dead Sea Scrolls, together with the resulting research, have transformed the “new perspective” into the “old perspective”<sup>(12)</sup>. Additionally entire new areas of research and understanding with regard to the Judaism of the late second Temple period and the interactions between them, including the Jesus movement, are emerging<sup>(13)</sup>.

Sander’s reconstruction of Judaism is flawed precisely because he presents a homogenized view of Judaism that respects neither the internal diversification of Judaism nor the often harsh polemical tensions between the various Torah schools. As Jacob Neusner has demonstrated, Sanders constructed an illusionary and artificial pattern of so-called Palestinian Judaism<sup>(14)</sup>. To focus predominantly on Rabbinic and Talmudic traditions of the post-second century and then to retroject this pattern back into the first century is precisely what scholars have rejected, for example, with regard to the applicability of second and third century Gnosticism as a tool for understanding the background of such New Testament documents like 1 Corinthians.

Among captivities that must be broken is the continued domination of such distorting descriptors as “Judaism” and “Christian/Christianity” in Sander’s discussion of Paul. Paul never uses the terminology “Christian/Christianity” and the New Testament only uses the terms “Christian/Christians” three times<sup>(15)</sup>. For contemporary scholars to use such non-New Testament language in discussing Pauline thought inserts characterizations from a much later period that are bound to lead to gross distortions. Paul refers to believers in Christ as “saints”<sup>(16)</sup> and he himself is part of a larger, broader Jesus movement that is never characterized by him as either Christian or Christianity. Along these same lines I also think Ed Sanders gets it fundamentally wrong when he argues that this “is what Paul finds

<sup>(9)</sup> See, for example, J.D.G. Dunn, ‘4QMMT and Galatians’, *NTS* 43 (1997) 147-153.

<sup>(10)</sup> See the detailed criticism by J. NEUSNER, “Comparing Judaism: Review of E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*”, *HR* 18 (1978) 177-191.

<sup>(11)</sup> E.P. SANDERS, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Philadelphia 1997).

<sup>(12)</sup> See K.P. DONFRIED, “Justification and Last Judgment in Paul – Twenty-Five Years Later”, *id.*, *Paul, Thessalonica and Early Christianity*; S.J. GATHERCOLE, *Where is Boasting?* (Grand Rapids 2002); also, S. WESTERHOLM, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul* (Grand Rapids 2004).

<sup>(13)</sup> See S. TALMON, “The Community of the Renewed Covenant”, *The Community of the Renewed Covenant. The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. ULRICH – J. VANDERKAM) (Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series, 10; Notre Dame, IN 1994) 3-24.

<sup>(14)</sup> See NEUSNER, “Comparing Judaism”.

<sup>(15)</sup> Acts 11,26; 26,28; 1 Pet 4,16

<sup>(16)</sup> See, for example, 1 Cor 1,2 and Rom 1,7

wrong with Judaism: it is not Christianity”<sup>(17)</sup>. Such an assertion already carries with it a presupposition about a split between “Judaism” and “Christianity” in the first half of the first century that must be categorically rejected. It must be recognized that Paul is not involved in an *extra-mural* battle between Christians and Jews but in an *intramural* set of disagreements that take place within the Judaisms of the late Second Temple period. As we will attempt to indicate, the new texts from Qumran, representing at least one type of Judaism in the midst of others, raise serious questions about the appropriateness of the solutions offered by the alleged “new perspective”.

It is Paul’s Jewishness, for lack of a more precise term, and his intramural conflict with some of the Judaisms of his day that require sustained focus and concentration and it is precisely at this point that the interpretation of the Dead Sea Scrolls will eventually afford a new foundation for rethinking Paul by providing the detailed contexts of another Jewish community that overlapped with the Pauline communities both chronologically and theologically, i.e. the Essene Qumran *yahad* that self-identifies itself as the community of the new covenant<sup>(18)</sup>.

In this context Shemaryahu Talmon’s makes the crucial point that the Qumran community, the *yahad*, is a movement “prophetically inspired and inclined to apocalypticism” and that it “dissents from the emerging brand of Pharisaic Judaism at the turn of the era” which represents a rationalist stream that first surfaces in Ezra and Nehemiah. Both movements, the prophetic and the rational, generate further diversification and, by the turn of the era, this process culminated in the distinct nonuniformity and heterogeneity of Judaism<sup>(19)</sup>.

Daniel Schwartz, deepening such observations, has argued that there is a fundamental dissimilarity between the Qumran sectarians and rabbinic Judaism with regard to the very nature of the law. The Qumran attitudes on the validity of contemporary divine revelation and on predestination as opposed to free will are all corollaries of what he argues is a fundamental contradiction between priestly realism and rabbinic nominalism. Essential to that difference is that the priests did not, in fact, depend upon the law for their authority whereas the sages and the rabbis had their authority only through the law<sup>(20)</sup>.

Furthermore, the Pharisees are accused of following “false laws, finding ways around the requirements of the law, and pronouncing false verdicts in legal cases — practices leading to the virtual annulment of Jewish law in the view of the sect. Indeed, the very existence of such laws constitutes an annulment of the Torah, because it replaces Torah laws with the laws of the Pharisees”. For the Qumran community tradition could not be authoritative “since all Israel had gone astray. The true way had only been rediscovered by

<sup>(17)</sup> SANDERS, *Paul*, 552.

<sup>(18)</sup> CD 6,19; 8,21; 19,33; 20,12.

<sup>(19)</sup> TALMON, “Community”, 22.

<sup>(20)</sup> D. SCHWARTZ, “Law and Truth: On Qumran-Sadducean and Rabbinic views of the Law”, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Forty Years of Research* (eds. D. DIMANT – U. RAPPAPORT) (Leiden 1992) 229-240.

the sect's teacher", the Teacher of Righteousness<sup>(21)</sup>. One might already at this point invite the question whether this is not strikingly evocative of assertions posited by Apostle Paul?

It is only when such dissimilar assumptions of the *yahad* and the rationalist stream are sorted out that one can begin to understand the nature of the dialogue — often polemical — that takes place between these two members of the larger family of Second Temple Judaism. Both Talmon and Schwartz suggest that at key points Paul has perspectives that cohere remarkably well with that of the *yahad* over against the Pharisaic stream. While comparisons are important, our ultimate goal must be to assess whether a deeper penetration of the contextual reality of the Qumran community can allow us more profound insight into the structure and logic of Pauline thought.

### 3. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Distinctive Perspectives*

#### a) The Contextual Approach

The great value of the Qumran library for Pauline scholarship is that it provides us with 900 texts all chronologically preceding the Jesus movement and its Pauline actualization. In light of these texts discovered in 1947 and all published by the mid-1990's, the following question is urgent: can the Jewishness of Paul be better comprehended by a detailed and careful analysis of such primary Qumran texts as the Community Rule (1QS), the Damascus Document (CD), the Commentaries/pesharim and the Thanksgiving Hymns/Hodayot (1QH)? Will such careful readings help identify and expose certain items in Paul that might otherwise have been inadequately recognized? Some areas to which the Qumran texts have heightened my sensitivity to select themes or texts in 1 Thessalonians include<sup>(22)</sup>:

1. eschatological/apocalyptic similarities in their intense expectation of the final consummation of history;

2. the election and calling of God, as when Paul writes to the Thessalonian church that "we know, brothers and sisters beloved by God, that he has chosen (ἐκλογή) you" (1,4);

3. holiness/sanctification, as in 1 Thess 4,3, "For this is the will of God, your sanctification" (literally, holiness [ἁγιασμός];

4. the light/day – night/darkness contrasts and the use of the term "sons of light". In 1 Thess 5,5 Paul writes: "for you are all sons of light and sons of the day; we are not of the night or of darkness". One of the major descriptors for the *yahad* is that they are "sons of light" [בְּנֵי אֹרֶךְ];

5. the wrath/salvation dualism. "For God has destined us not for wrath but for obtaining salvation..." are words found in 1 Thess 5,9;

6. the phrase "church of God" which has its direct parallel in the Qumran term קהל אל;

(21) L.H. SCHIFFMAN, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*. The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran (Philadelphia – Jerusalem 1994) 254.

(22) For a more complete discussion see K.P. DONFRIED, "Paul the Jew - But of What Sort?", *Testimony and Interpretation*. Early Christology in Its Judeo-Hellenistic Milieu. Festschrift P. Pokorny (eds. J. MRAZEK – J. ROSKOVEC) (London 2004), 11-27.

7. ἄτακτος and the ethical order. It is now quite likely that the “idlers” or “loafers” of 1 Thess 5,14, the ἄτακτοι in Greek, should, on the basis of parallel texts related to the Dead Sea Scrolls, be translated as those “who are out of order”, namely not following the סדר, the order of the community as described in 1 Thess 4,1-12. One of the major documents of the Qumran library is *The Community Rule* (1QS), the סדר הייחוד, that contains admonitions and encouragements to properly follow its order.

Again it is important to emphasize that the goal is not primarily the seeking of parallels between the Pauline letters and the Qumran texts but rather to ascertain whether a careful contextual reading of the texts from the Dead Sea can help illuminate Paul’s theology and method of argumentation. Areas to be considered for more detailed probing include biblical hermeneutics, temple purity, sanctification/holiness, righteousness of God/justification, election and works of the law. I now turn to some brief reflections with reference to these themes.

#### b) Biblical Hermeneutics

Since, in contrast to the Rabbis, Qumran granted “normative importance to contemporary (since Sinai!) divine revelation”<sup>(23)</sup> it used the *pesher* method of biblical interpretation, a contemporizing form of interpretation in which the prophetic texts are understood as referring to present events in the life of the *yahad*. More specifically, in its use of biblical texts it divided the law into distinct categories, i.e., the revealed (*nigleh*) and hidden (*nistar*).

A further result of the *yahad*’s prophetic hermeneutic is sharp criticism of Pharisaic rationalist interpretation. They are referred to as *dorshe halaqot*, meaning literally “seekers after smooth things”, but more properly understood as “interpreters of false laws”. In CD 4,19-20 they are called “builders of the wall...”, a phrase remarkably similar to the mishnaic tractate Avot 1,1 where it is taught that one should “Build a fence around the Torah”. Similarly, in 1QH 4,10-11 it is stated that “they planned evil [literally, “Belial”] against me to replace your Torah which You taught in my heart with smooth things [i.e. false laws] (which they taught) to Your people”.

Paul not only reveals a remarkably similar exegetical method but also, at a minimum, implicitly analogous criticisms of the Pharisees as well as a comparable use of introductory formulas in citing the Bible and utilization of *testimonia* lists.

#### c) The Language of Temple Purity and Sanctification

As is unmistakably evident in the Qumran literature, the *yahad* understood itself as a replacement temple, a virtual temple, in view of the utter corruption of the Jerusalem Temple from which they had separated (CD 20,23; 1QS 8,5). As a result there is a stringent application of purity to the *yahad* as is testified by the presence of multiple *Mikva’ot* at the community center. Noteworthy also is the Qumran community’s refusal to distinguish between cultic and moral impurity. Magness states the matter well: “To the

<sup>(23)</sup> SCHWARTZ, “Law and Truth”, 238.

sectarians, purity and impurity were manifestations of the moral state of the individual”<sup>(24)</sup>.

There is sufficient language in the Pauline letters to suggest that Paul also viewed his communities as being replacements for the Temple and that he is deeply concerned with issues of purity. Most striking is the reference that “we are the temple of the living God” in the broader context of 2 Cor 6,14-7,1:

Do not be mismatched with unbelievers. For what partnership is there between righteousness and lawlessness? Or what fellowship is there between light and darkness? What agreement does Christ have with Beliar? Or what does a believer share with an unbeliever? What agreement has the temple of God with idols? For we are the temple of the living God; as God said,

“I will live in them and walk among them,  
and I will be their God,  
and they shall be my people.

Therefore come out from them,  
and be separate from them, says the Lord,  
and touch nothing unclean [ἀκαθάρτος];  
then I will welcome you,  
and I will be your father,  
and you shall be my sons and daughters,  
says the Lord Almighty”.

Since we have these promises, beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from every defilement of body and of spirit, making holiness perfect in the fear of God [καθαρίσωμεν ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος, ἐπιτελοῦντες ἀγιωσύνην ἐν φόβῳ θεοῦ].

Almost identical is the use of “temple” language in 1 Cor 3,16 and 6,19, particularly with the “you” references in the plural pointing to the community rather than the individual. The former is especially instructive: “Do you not know that you are God’s temple and that God’s Spirit dwells in you? If anyone destroys God’s temple, God will destroy that person. For God’s temple is holy, and you are that temple”. The application of this way of thinking can also be found in 1 Cor 5,1-13. This replacement temple community cannot tolerate immorality since the impurity of one will defile the entire church. Since “our paschal lamb, Christ, has been sacrificed”, the “festival”, presumably the sacred meal of the community, must be celebrated not with the old yeast of malice and evil but “with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth”. So that this can happen Deut 17,7 is invoked: “Drive out the wicked person from among you”. The presence of God in this sacred community demands purity. Paul’s *serek*, i.e. is “order” or “rule” in 1 Thess 4,1-9 contains similar themes, including this equivalent pattern of uncleanness/impurity being opposed by the concepts of sanctification/holiness<sup>(25)</sup>.

<sup>(24)</sup> J. MAGNESS, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids 2002) 137.

<sup>(25)</sup> See further on this K.P. Donfried, “Paul and Qumran: The Possible Influence of תָּרַח on 1 Thessalonians”, *Paul, Thessalonica and Early Christianity*, 221-232.

This use of temple and purity language in the Pauline letters raises a not unrelated question: Paul's understanding of his being chosen by God to be an apostle in relationship to his priestly role, especially as he refers to it in Rom 15,16: "Nevertheless on some points I have written to you rather boldly by way of reminder, because of the grace given me by God to be a minister of Christ Jesus to the Gentiles in the priestly service of the gospel of God, so that the offering of the Gentiles may be acceptable, sanctified by the Holy Spirit". In particular, what does Paul intend when he writes to the Romans about his "priestly service" [εἰς τὸ εἶναι με λειτουργὸν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, ἱερουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα γένηται ἡ προσφορά τῶν ἐθνῶν εὐπρόσδεκτος, ἡγιασμένη ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ]?

The term λειτουργία is used in a distinctly liturgical setting in Phil 2,17: "But even if I am being poured out as a libation over the sacrifice and the offering of your faith, I am glad and rejoice with all of you" [Ἀλλὰ εἰ καὶ σπένδομαι ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν, χαίρω καὶ συγχαίρω πᾶσιν ὑμῖν] and it would appear that Paul is, in Romans 15, describing himself as being involved in a distinctly liturgical act, viz., preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles, and this coheres well with his formulation at the opening of Romans: "For God, whom I worship [λατρεύω] with my spirit in the proclamation of the gospel of his Son..." (1,9). Fitzmyer is to be followed when he concludes that in "his mission to the Gentiles Paul sees his function to be like that of a Jewish priest dedicated to the service of God in his Temple". It is likely that for Paul in this context ἱερουργέω means "to function as a priest", and that the "service of the priests in the Jerusalem Temple provides the background of Paul's metaphorical language..."<sup>(26)</sup>. In this act of worship, however, the priestly offering does not include animals but repentant Gentiles.

The question that faces the interpreter in such a discussion is this: whether Paul's pharisaic background (Phil 3,5) would have been sufficient to allow him to use the sacrificial language of the Temple cult in such a metaphorical way? Or, alternatively, is not a closer proximity to concepts situated within the *yahad* a more likely source of influence than his pharisaic background, particularly since the Apostle to the Gentiles views his communities in Christ as replacements for the Temple much as did the covenanters at Qumran?

#### d) Righteousness of God/Justification in the Context of Election

Precisely the *yahad*'s confidence in predestination within a context of dualism differentiates them from the other Judaisms of the day. Those predestined for righteousness have been given the knowledge of God as one reads in 1QH: "And I, through my understanding, have come to know You, my God, through the spirit which You placed within me.... In Your holy spirit You have [o]pened to me knowledge of the mystery of Your understanding". As a result of this knowledge, as a consequence of the gift of

<sup>(26)</sup> J.A. FITZMYER, *Romans: a new translation with introduction and commentary* (AB33; New York 1993) 711.



“the spirit of the counsel of the truth of God” (1QS3,6-9), the elect or chosen of God “can discern the correct path and follow the divine will”<sup>(27)</sup>.

Paul explicitly refers to the Thessalonians as ἐκλογή (1 Thess 1,4) and in 4,9 that they have been “God taught” (θεοδιδάκτος). As with Qumran so for Paul the theme of election is foundational from his earliest letter, 1 Thessalonians, to Romans, his last. In Rom 8,30 one reads: “And those whom he predestined [προώρισεν] he also called [ἐκάλεσεν]; and those whom he called he also justified; and those whom he justified [ἐδικαίωσεν] he also glorified [ἐδόξασεν]”. In this text it is election/predestination that precedes the reference to “justification” and it is the theme of election/predestination that provides the appropriate context for understanding the function of “justification” in Pauline thought.

In the midst of this remarkable commonality the further use of similar language and concepts in relationship to the righteousness of God is truly extraordinary. In fact I would argue that the community at Qumran presented Paul with the conceptual tools and language for his understanding of justification/righteousness of God in light of the Christ event. Allow me to cite some the Qumran language in the context in which it appears:

“As for me,  
 I belong to wicked mankind,  
 to the company of perverse flesh [בשר עול].  
 My iniquities, rebellions, and sins,  
 together with the perversity of my heart,  
 belong to the assembly of wormy rot  
 and to those who walk in darkness.  
 For mankind has no way,  
 And man is unable to establish his steps  
 since justification [המשפט] is with God  
 and perfection of way is out of His hand.  
 All things come to pass by His knowledge;  
 He establishes all things by His design  
 and without Him nothing is done.  
 As for me,  
 if I stumble, the mercies of God [חסדי אל]  
 shall be my eternal salvation [ישועתי לעד].  
 If I stagger because of the sin of flesh,  
 my justification [משפטי] shall be  
 by the righteousness of God [בצדקת אל] which endures for ever.  
 When my distress is unleashed  
 He will deliver my soul from the Pit  
 and will direct my steps to the way.  
 He will draw me near by His grace,  
 and by His mercy will He bring my justification [משפטי].  
 He will judge me in the righteousness of His truth  
 and in the greatness of His goodness

<sup>(27)</sup> G. VERMES, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (New York 1997) with modification.

He will pardon all my sins.  
 Through His righteousness he will cleanse me  
 of the uncleanness of man  
 and of the sins of the children of men,  
 that I may confess to God His righteousness,  
 and His majesty to the Most High" (*IQS 11,9-15*)<sup>(28)</sup>.  
 I lean on Thy grace [בחסדיכה]  
 and on the multitude of Thy mercies [רחמיכה],  
 for Thou wilt pardon iniquity [תכפר עוון],  
 and through Thy righteousness [בצדקתכה]  
 [Thou wilt purify man] of his sin [אנוש מאשמה].  
 Not for his sake wilt Thou do it,  
 [but for the sake of Thy glory].  
 For Thou hast created the just and the wicked (*IQH 12,36-40*;  
*formerly IQH 4*)<sup>(29)</sup>.

The theme of human sinfulness and wickedness, the assertion that "judgment shall be by the righteousness of God" and the emphasis on the mercy of a gracious God in whom human righteousness is rooted are remarkably analogous to Paul's teaching about justification by grace. A closer examination of this terminology is revealing. The term δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, "the righteousness of God", is used by Paul in Rom 1,17, 3,5, 21, 22; 10,3; and 2 Cor 5,21, often in close connection with his comments on justification. It is not insignificant that the exact phrase "the righteousness of God", not found in the Old Testament, is used here as well as in *IQM 4,6* as [צדק אל] and in *IQS 10,25* and *11,12* [צדקת אל]. This prior usage of the concept by the *yahad* would support the observation that δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is not a Pauline creation. Further, at the beginning of the passage cited above, *IQS 11,9*, there is a striking parallel to Paul's use of σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας ("sinful flesh"; Rom 8,3): *עיל בשר עיל* (perverse flesh). Also related to the use of *σάρξ ἁμαρτίας* in Rom 8,5-8 is *עוון בשר*, "the sin of flesh" in *IQS 11,9* and *12*.

By the weaving of these themes into a more coherent unity, these Qumran themes move well beyond the Old Testament. It is indeed possible that the *yahad* permitted Paul not only to use but also to reformulate these emphases based on his encounter with the Risen Christ (Gal 1,15-16). Not to be overlooked, of course, are the obvious differences between Paul and the *yahad*, the most notable being the centrality of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ in. Because the messiah has come, the righteousness of God has already now been revealed. For the *yahad*, who are still waiting for messiah(s), their radicalized obedience to Torah suggests that such a manifestation of the righteousness of God still remains a future expectation and goal. Thus Fitzmyer correctly recognizes that this community's emphasis on the mercy and the righteousness of God "is transitional, because it is not yet the full-blown idea of Pauline justification by grace through faith"<sup>(30)</sup>.

<sup>(28)</sup> VERMES, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, with modification.

<sup>(29)</sup> VERMES, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, with modification.

<sup>(30)</sup> J.A. FITZMYER, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls", *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years* (ed. P.W. FLINT – J.C. VANDERKAM) (Leiden 1999) 604.

## e) The Works of the law

The examples just cited have suggested a proximity between selected terminology found in the Dead Sea Scrolls to Paul's theological formulations. There is yet another phrase that Paul uses, ἔργα νόμου, ("works of the law"), that has been uncovered in the Qumran scrolls. Given the enormous controversy surrounding the meaning of this phrase, I wish in the context of this lecture to make only two preliminary points:

The phrase, ἔργα νόμου, has no parallel in the Jewish Bible. However, the precise parallel phrase to Paul's ἔργα νόμου is found in the Qumran texts. In 4QMMT C27 one reads חֲסִידֵי חֻמֵּי מִשְׁכַּח מִעֲשֵׂי חֻמֵּי חֻמֵּי ("some works of the law"), in 4QMMT C 30-31 the emphasis falls on the correct practice of these deeds ("in your deed (בעשותך) you may be reckoned as righteous"). Particularly important here is that the phrase חֲסִידֵי חֻמֵּי מִעֲשֵׂי חֻמֵּי ("some works of the law"), is explicitly related to the pursuit of righteousness: the one who does "works of the law" is reckoned as righteous.

Although Paul sharply and, at times, polemically criticizes the misuse of the Torah in his letters, I am unable to reach the conclusion that Paul has categorically rejected the Torah in light of the Christ event. One needs to recognize that Paul's polemic against the "works of the Law" is frequently found within the context of a broader apologetic as is the case in Rom 3,31: ("Do we then overthrow the law by this faith? By no means! On the contrary, we uphold the law") and in Rom 7,12 ("So the law is holy, and the commandment is holy and just and good"). In my judgment the critical text for understanding Paul's new understanding of the Torah is found in Rom 8,3-4: "For God has done what the law, weakened by the flesh, could not do: by sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and to deal with sin, he condemned sin in the flesh, so that the just requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us [ἵνα τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν], who walk not according to the flesh but according to the Spirit". Critical is the interpretation of "just requirement" and that "the law might be fulfilled". While the "works of the Law" are not the basis of righteousness — only Christ is — that does not deny a positive function for the Law, properly understood, for those who are "in Christ". In such an interpretative context the term τέλος in Rom 10,4 would mean that Christ is the goal or intention of the Torah, not its termination or end.

\*  
\* \*

I have urged the following considerations as necessary for a comprehensive understanding of Pauline thought:

— Paul's Jewishness. Although Paul's Jewishness undergoes several transitions, it remains foundational for a proper understanding of his theology. Numerous manifestations of his Jewishness have remarkable similarities with the prophetic stream represented in the texts found at the Dead Sea, even though the decisive transformation of Paul's Jewishness results from his encounter with the risen Lord and the call extended to him to serve as the apostle to the Gentiles.

— Paul's proclamation of the Gospel employs a politico-religious language that is in tension and conflict with the political ideology of the

Roman Empire and this results in the suffering, imprisonment and persecution of the Apostle as well as his congregations who are situated in the midst of the religious, cultural and political dynamics of the Graeco-Roman world.

The proper assessment and evaluation of these factors will at a minimum require the following:

- an examination of the Pauline letters in their specific and contingent as well as their broader and coherent contexts;

- a careful analysis of the Dead Sea Scrolls and other related Jewish literature;

- the incorporation of the relevant archaeological, historical and literary evidence for the reconstruction of the political, cultural and religious contexts of the cities to which Paul's letters are addressed.

To conclude this rapid review of selected aspects of Pauline thought, I would only wish to say that it has become apparent in my ongoing research in the area of Pauline theology that the Qumran texts have opened for us new ways of understanding Paul's Jewishness in the midst of the diversification present in Second Temple Judaism. A new beginning has been inaugurated; that, however, should not conceal the fact that much diligent and interdisciplinary work remains to be done. Definitive conclusions are still in the realm of eschatological expectation!

Neilson Library A10  
Smith College  
Northampton, MA 01063

Karl P. DONFRIED

## LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

An dieser Stelle werden die für *Biblica* eingesandten Bücher verzeichnet. Eine Beurteilung ist damit nicht gegeben. Werke, die von der Redaction nicht ausdrücklich erbeten worden sind, werden nicht zurückgesandt, auch wenn ihnen eine weitere Besprechung nicht zuteil werden kann.

Eingesandte Bücher und Artikel gehen an den Redaktor des *Elenchus of Biblica* zur Anzeige nach dessen Gutdünken.

Die Anschrift, an die wir die Sendungen zu richten bitten, ist Schriftleitung *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, via della Pilotta 25, I-00187 Roma, Italien.

**Abasciano**, Brian J., *Paul's Use of the Old Testament in Romans 9.1-9*. An Intertextual and Theological Exegesis (Library of New Testament Studies 301). London, T&T Clark International, 2005. xi-265. 16 × 24. £65.00

**Alexander**, Philip, *The Mystical Texts*. Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and Related Manuscripts (Library of Second Temple Studies 61). London – New York, T&T Clark, 2006. x-171 p. 16 × 24. £65.00

**Allen**, James P., *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramidal Texts* (Writings from the Ancient World 23). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2005. x-471 p. 15 × 23. \$39.95

**Allison**, Dale C., Jr., *Studies in Matthew*. Interpretation Past and Present. Grand Rapids, Michigan, Baker Academic, 2005. 282 p. 16 × 23,5. \$34.99

**Álvarez Valdés**, Ariel, *La Nueva Jerusalén, ¿Ciudad celeste o ciudad terrestre?* Estudio exegético y teológico de Ap 21,1-8 (Asociación Bíblica Española 42, Institución San Jerónimo). Estella, Editorial Verbo Divino, 2005. 404 p. 16 × 24

**Bar-Ilan**, Meir, *Biblical Numerology*. Rehovot, Association for Jewish Astrology and Numerology, 2005. xvii-239 p. 17,5 × 25

**Bartholomew**, Craig G. – **Green**, Joel B. – **Thiselton**, Anthony C. (eds.), *Reading Luke*. Interpretation, Reflection, Formation (Scripture and Hermeneutics Series 6). Milton Keynes, Paternoster Press – Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 2005. xxii-484 p. 15,5 × 23,5

**Basta**, Pasquale, *Gezerah Shawah*. Storia, forme e metodi dell'analogia biblica (Subsidia Biblica 26). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2006. 119 p. 17 × 24. €13

**Bazyliński**, Stanisław, *A Guide to Biblical Research*. Introductory Notes (Subsidia Biblica 28). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2006. xviii-169 p. 16,5 × 24

**Beattie**, Gillian, *Women and Marriage in Paul and his Early Interpreters* (JSNTSS 296). London – New York, T&T Clark International, 2005. xii-181 p. 16 × 24. £60.00

**Berger**, Klaus, *Gesù* (Books). Introduzione all'edizione italiana di Rinaldo Fabris. Brescia, Queriniana, 2006. 672 pp. 13,5 × 21. €46

**Bianchini**, Francesco, *L'elogio di sé in Cristo*. L'utilizzo della περιαντολογία nel contesto di Filipesi 3,1-4,1 (AnBib 164). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2006. (8)-322 pp. 16,5 × 23,5. €27

**Bisi**, Marisa, *I dieci comandamenti*. Meditazioni sul decalogo, via di libertà (Formazione). Roma, Edizioni AdP, 2006. 111 p. 14 × 21. €8

**Bosshard-Nepustil**, Erich, *Vor uns die Sintflut*. Studien zu Text, Kontexten und Rezeption der Fluterzählung Gensis 6-9 (BWANT 165). Stuttgart, Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 2005. 336 p. 16 × 24. €45 – SFr 78,-

**Botta**, Alejandro F., *Los doce Profetas menores* (Conozca su Biblia). Minneapolis, Augsburg Fortress, 2006. vii-160 p. 15 × 23. \$15.00

**Bovon**, François, *Luc le théologien*. Troisième édition augmentée (Le Monde de la Bible 5). Genève, Labor et Fides, 2006. 631 p. 15 × 22,5

**Bovon**, François, *Studies in Early Christianity*. Grand Rapids, Baker Academic, 2005. viii-336 p. 15 × 22,5. \$34.99

**Bovon**, François, *The Last Days of Jesus*. Louisville – London, Westminster John Knox Press, 2006. x-101 p. 14 × 21,5. \$17.95

**Brant**, Jo-Ann – **Hedrick**, Charles W. – **Shea**, Chris (eds.), *Ancient Fiction*. The Matrix of Early Christian and Jewish Narrative (Symposium Series 32). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2005. xvii-372 p. 15 × 23. \$39.95

**Bredin**, Mark (ed.), *Studies in the Book of Tobit*. A Multidisciplinary Approach (Library of Second Temple Studies 55). London – New York, T&T Clark, 2006. xi-193 p. 16 × 24. £65.00

**Brettler**, Mark Zvi, *How to Read the Bible*. Philadelphia, The Jewish Publication Society, 2005. xv-384 p. 15 × 23,5. \$35.00

**Broccardo**, Carlo, *La fede emarginata*. Analisi narrativa di Luca 4-9 (Studi e Ricerche). Assisi, Cittadella Editrice, 2006. 358 p. 15 × 21. €18

**Bulkeley**, Tim, *Amos: Hypertext Bible Commentary*. A new kind of Bible commentary written for the electronic age, CD edition. Auckland, Hypertext Bible, 2005. \$25.00

**Burk**, Denny, *Articular Infinitives in the Greek of the New Testament*. On the Exegetical Benefit of Grammatical Precision (New Testament Monographs 14). Sheffield, Phoenix Press, 2006. xv-179. 16,5 × 24. £35.00 – \$55.00 – €47.50

**Carbajosa**, Ignacio, *Las características de la versión Siríaca de los Salmos* (Sal 90-150 de la Peshitta) (AnBib 162). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2006. 465 pp. 16,5 × 23,5

**Carter**, Warren, *The Roman Empire and the New Testament*. An Essential Guide (Abingdon Essential Guides). Nashville, Abingdon Press, 2006. xi-148 pp. 15 × 23. £9.99

**Casalini**, Nello, OFM, *Introduzione a Marco* (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Analecta 66). Jerusalem, Franciscan Printing Press, 2005. 303 p. 17 × 24

**Casalini**, Nello, OFM, *Lettura di Marco*. Narrativa, esegetica, teologica (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Analecta 67). Jerusalem, Franciscan Printing Press, 2005. 381 p. 17 × 24

**Charlesworth**, James H. (ed.), *Jesus and Archaeology*. Grand Rapids, MA – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2006. xxv-740 p. 16 × 23,5. \$50.00 – £28.99

**Chennattu**, Rekha M., *Johannine Discipleship as a Covenant Relationship*. Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 2005. xxiv-256 p. 15 × 23. £17.99

**Collins**, John J., *The Bible after Babel*. Historical Criticism in a Postmodern Age. Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U.K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005. x-201 p. 15 × 23. \$18.00 – £9.99

**Costin**, Teodor, *Il perdono di Dio nel vangelo di Matteo*. Uno studio esegetico-teologico (Tesi Gregoriana, Serie Teologia 133). Roma, Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 2005. 250 p. 17 × 24. €18

**David**, Robert – **Jinbachian**, Manuel (éds.), *Traduire la Bible Hébraïque*. De la Septante à la Nouvelle Bible Segond. *Translating the Hebrew Bible*. From the Septuagint to the Nouvelle Bible Segond (Sciences bibliques 15). Montréal, Médiaspaul, 2005. 428 p. 14 × 21,5

**De Troyer**, Kristin – **Lange**, Armin (eds.), *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library*. The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations (Symposium Series 30). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2005. vii-236 p. 15 × 23. \$24.95

**Debanné**, Marc J., *Enthymemes in the Letters of Paul* (Library of New Testament Studies 303). London, T&T Clark, 2006. xxiv-294 p. 16 × 24. £70.00

**Dell**, Catherine J., *The Book of Proverbs in Social and Theological Context*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2006. x-225 p. 14 × 22. £48.00 – \$85.00

**Delorme**, Jean, *Parole et récit évangéliques*. Études sur l'évangile de Marc (LD 209). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf – Montréal, Médiaspaul, 2006. 326 pp. 13,5 × 21,5. €28

**deSilva**, David A., *4 Maccabees*. Introduction and Commentary on the Greek Text in Codex Sinaiticus (Septuagint Commentary Series). Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2006. xlv-303 p. 16 × 24,5. €109 – \$156.00

**Destro**, Adriana – **Pesce**, Mauro, *Forme culturali del cristianesimo nascente* (Scienze Umane 2). Brescia, Morcelliana, 2005. 202 p. 15,5 × 22,5. €18

**di Pede**, Elena, *Au-delà du refus: l'espoir*. Recherches sur la cohérence narrative de Jr 32-45 (TM). Berlin – New York, Walter de Gruyter, 2005. xvii-404 p. 16 × 23,5. €118

**Dirksen**, Peter B., *1 Chronicles* (Historical Commentary on the Old Testament). Leuven – Dudley, MA, Peeters, 2005. xvii-358 p. 16 × 24. €30

**Donfried**, Karl Paul, *Who Owns the Bible?* (Companions to the New Testament). New York, The Crossroad Publishing Company, 2006. xv-176 p. 15 × 22,5. \$19.95

**Dunderberg**, Ismo, *The Beloved Disciple in Conflict?* Revisiting the Gospels of John and Thomas. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2006. xiii-249 p. 14 × 22. £45.00

**Dunn**, James D. G. – **McKnight**, Scot (eds.), *The Historical Jesus in Recent Research* (Sources for Biblical and Theological Study 10). Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 2005. xvi-592. 15,5 × 23,5. \$42.95

**Sparks**, Kenton L., *Ancient Texts for the Study of the Hebrew Bible*. A Guide to the Background Literature. Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 2005. xxxvii-514 p. 16 × 23,5



**Spencer, F. Scott**, *Dancing Girls, Loose Ladies, and Women of the Cloth. The Women in Jesus' Life*. New York – London, Continuum, 2004. xi-196 p. 15 × 23. £14.99

**Stegman, Thomas**, *The Character of Jesus. The Linchpin to Paul's Argument in 2 Corinthians* (AnBib 158). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2005. xi-470 p. 16,5 × 24. €30

**Stepp, Perry L.**, *Leadership Succession in the World of the Pauline Circle* (New Testament Monographs 5). Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2005. xvi-227 p. 16 × 24

**Stock, Klemens, S. I.**, *La Liturgia della Parola. Spiegazione dei Vangeli domenicali e festivi, Anno B (Marco)* (Bibbia e Preghiera 45). Roma, Edizioni AdP, 2002. 390 p. 14 × 21. €11

**Stone, Ken**, *Practicing Safer Texts. Food, Sex and Bible in Queer Perspective* (Queering Theology Series). London – New York, T&T Clark International, 2005. vi-185 p. 15,5 × 23,5. £30.00

**Strong, John T. – Tuell, Steven S.** (eds.), *Constituting the Community. Studies on the Polity of Ancient Israel in Honor of S. Dean McBride Jr.* Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 2005. xi-331 p. 16 × 23,5. \$49.50

**Sugirtharajah, R. S.**, *The Bible and Empire. Postcolonial Explorations*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2005. vi-247 p. 15 × 22,5. £17.99 – \$27.99

**Syreeni, Kari** (utgiven av), *Nomen et Nomina. Festschrift till Stig Norin* (Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok 70). Uppsala, Uppsala Exegetiska Sällskap, 2005. 387 p. 15,5 × 21

**Thomas, John Christopher**, *The Spirit of the New Testament*. Leiden – Blandford Forum, Deo Publishing, 2005. xiii-283 p. 15,5 × 24

**Tolmie, D. Francois**, *Persuading the Galatians. A Text-Centred Rhetorical Analysis of a Pauline Letter* (WUNT – 2. Reihe 190). Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2005. xii-287 p. 15,5 × 23. €54

**Tosolini, Fabrizio**, *The Letter to the Romans. Towards a New Interpretation*. Taipei Hsien, Fu Jen Catholic University Press – Osaka, Asian Study Centre, 2005. xiv-493 p. 18 × 25,5

**Utzschneider, Helmut**, *Micha* (Zürcher Bibelkommentare AT 24.1). Zürich, Theologischer Verlag, 2005. 175 p. 15,5 × 23,5

**Van Cangh, Jean-Marie – Toumpsin, Alphonse**, *L'Évangile de Marc. Un original hébreu?* (Langues et cultures anciennes 4). Bruxelles, Éditions Safran, 2005. 460 p. 17 × 24

**Van Neste, Ray**, *Cohesion and Structure in the Pastoral Epistles* (JSNTSS 280). London – New York, T&T Clark International, 2004. xii-354 p. 16 × 24. £70.00

**van Wijk-Bos, Johanna W. H.**, *Making Wise the Simple. The Torah in Christian Faith and Practice*. Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U.K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005. xxiv-329 p. 16 × 23,5. \$20.00 – £16.99

**VanderKam, James C.**, *From Joshua to Caiaphas. High Priests after the Exile*. Minneapolis, Fortress Press – Assen, Van Gorcum, 2004. xix-548 p. 15,5 × 23,5. €38

**Vanhoeye, Albert, S. I.**, *Le lettura bibliche delle domeniche. Anno B* (Ascolto della Parola). Roma, Edizioni AdP, 2005. 374 p. 14 × 21. €20

**Vermes, Geza**, *Scrolls, Scriptures and Early Christianity* (Library of Second Temple Studies 56). London – New York, T&T Clark International, 2005. viii-86 p. 16 × 24. £55.00

**Vette, Joachim**, *Samuel und Saul*. Ein Beitrag zur narrativen Poetik des Samuelbuches (Beiträge zum Verstehen der Bibel 13). Münster, Lit Verlag, 2005. ix-251 p. 16 × 23,5

*Vetus Latina*. 49. Arbeitsbericht der Stiftung, 38. Bericht des Instituts. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 2005. 63 p. 14,5 × 21

**von Rad, Gerhard**, *From Genesis to Chronicles*. Explorations in Old Testament Theology (Fortress Classics in Biblical Studies). Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2005. xix-286 p. 15 × 23. \$18.00

**Vos, Christiane de**, *Klage als Gotteslob aus der Tiefe*. Der Mensch vor Gott in den individuellen Klagepsalmen (Forschungen zum Alten Testament, 2. Reihe). Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2005. x-261 p. 15,5 × 23. €49

**Vriezen, T. C. – van der Woude, A. S.**, *Ancient Israelite and Early Jewish Literature*. Translated by Brian Doyle. Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2005. ix-766 p. 16 × 24. €59.00 – \$59.00

**Wagner, David**, *Geist und Tora*. Studien zur göttlichen Legitimation und Delegitimation von Herrschaft im Alten Testament anhand der Erzählungen über König Saul (Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte 15). Leipzig, Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2005. xi-452 p. 16 × 23,5

**Waltke, Walter**, *The Book of Proverbs*. Chapters 15-31 (The New International Commentary on the Old Testament). Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U.K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005. xxxiii-589 p. 16 × 24. \$50.00 – £29.95

**Ware, Bruce A.**, *Father, Son, & Holy Spirit*. Relationships, Roles, & Relevance. Wheaton, Crossway Books, 2005. 173 p. 14 × 21,5. \$14.99

**Warrington, Keith**, *Discovering the Holy Spirit in the New Testament*. Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 2005. x-230 p. 14 × 21,5. £9.99

**Weeks, Noel**, *Admonition and Curse*. The Ancient Near Eastern Treaty/Covenant Form as a Problem in Inter-Cultural Relations (JSOTSS 407). London – New York, T&T Clark International, 2004. viii-212 p. 16 × 24. £60.00

**Weinfeld, Moshe**, *Normative and Sectarian Judaism in the Second Temple Period* (Library of Second Temple Studies 54). London – New York, T&T Clark International, 2005. xii-329 p. 16 × 24. £70.00

**Welborn, L. L.**, *Paul, the Fool of Christ*. A Study of 1 Corinthians 1-4 in the Comic-Philosophic Tradition (JSNTSS 293, Early Christianity in Context). London – New York, T&T Clark International, 2005. xv-271 p. 16 × 24. £ 65.00

**Wénin, André**, *Dalla violenza alla speranza*. Cammini di umanizzazione nelle Scritture (Spiritualità biblica). Magnano, Edizioni Qiqajon, Comunità di Bose, 2005. 252 p. 13 × 20,5. €13,50

**Wiley, Tatha**, *Paul and the Gentile Women*. Reframing Galatians. New York – London, Continuum, 2005. 168 p. 14 × 21,5. £16.99

**Witherington, Ben III**, *The Problem with Evangelical Theology*. Testing the Exegetical Foundations of Calvinism, Dispensationalism, and Wesleyanism. Waco, Baylor University Press, 2005. xi-294 p. 15 × 22,5. \$29.95

**Witte, Markus – Fögen, Marie Theres** (Hrsg.), *Kodifizierung und Legitimierung des Rechts in der Antike und im Alten Orient* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte 5). Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, 2005. 151 p. 17 × 24,5

**Wolter, Michael** (Hrsg.), *Ethik als angewandte Ekklesiologie. Der Brief an die Epheser* (Monographische Reihe von >Benedictina<, Biblisch-Ökumenische Abteilung 17). Roma, >Benedictina< Publishing, 2005. vi-229 p. 17 × 24

**Wright, Richard M.**, *Linguistic Evidence for the Pre-Exilic Date of the Yahwistic Source* (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 419). London – New York, T&T Clark International, 2005. x-208 p. 16 × 24. £55.00

**Wyatt, Nick**, *The Mythic Mind. Essays on Cosmology and Religion in Ugaritic and Old Testament Literature* (BibleWorld). London – Oakville, Equinox, 2005. xiv-305 p. 15,5 × 23,5. Cloth: \$85.00 – £55.00; paper: \$37.50 – £24.99

**Yeo Khiok-khng (K. K.)** (ed.), *Navigating Romans through Cultures. Challenging Readings by Charting a New Course*. (Romans Through History and Cultures Series). New York – London, T&T Clark International, 2004. vi-326 p. 15 × 23. £25.00

**Zangenberg, Jürgen – Labahn, Michael** (eds.), *Christians as a Religious Minority in a Multicultural City. Modes of Interaction and Identity Formation in Early Imperial Rome* (JSNTSS 243, European Studies on Christian Origins). London – New York, T&T Clark International, 2004. xiii-202 p. 16 × 24. £65.00

**Zevini, Giorgio – Maritano, Mario** (a cura di), *La Lectio Divina nella vita della Chiesa* (Studi di Spiritualità 15). Roma, LAS, 2005. 224 p. 14,5 × 21. €13

ISSN 0006-0887

This periodical is indexed in the ATLA Religion Database, published by the American Theological Library Association, 250 S. Wacker Dr., 16th Flr., Chicago, IL 60606.  
E-mail: [atla@atla.com](mailto:atla@atla.com). <http://www.atla.com/>

---

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa



Associato all'Unione Stampa Periodica Italiana

---

Finito di stampare il 10 dicembre 2006  
Tip.: Ist. Salesiano Pio XI - Via Umbertide, 11 - 00181 Roma